



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 2014

No. 96

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 19, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IMMIGRATION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I usually come here to talk about the ongoing crisis in American cities and towns related to our unrelenting deportation of moms and dads and longtime residents with no criminal history.

There is no doubt we will see substantial action to dial back the record deportation this country has suffered over the past 5 years and a retargeting of deportations at criminals.

The only question is whether the Republican majority gets its act together

to participate in that process as legislators and leaders in the next 6 legislative days before the July 4 recess.

Now, in addition to the deportation crisis, we face a new crisis quickly becoming a human tragedy of catastrophic proportions. Thousands and thousands of young children are fleeing Central America because they think it is their only option for survival.

Faced with death threats, sexual assault, poverty, and no legal immigration options, little boys and girls are simply leaving their Central American countries by the tens of thousands.

Some are coming to the United States to reunite with relatives, while many others are seeking asylum in any country they can get to, including this one.

Girls as young as 11 and 12, threatened with rape in their own country, are risking rape, smugglers, murder, and exploitation for the slim chance of a life in the United States. Eighty percent are coming from just three countries—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—countries that top the list of the highest murder rates in the world.

Gangs, drugs, poverty, and hopelessness are driving kids as young as kindergartners to countries like Belize, Costa Rica, Mexico, and the United States. It is a complex international crisis that does not have easy solutions.

The Obama administration, Homeland Security, and FEMA are mobilizing like they would for a major natural disaster. They are trying to address each case one by one, following the laws of this country we have for unaccompanied minors, families, and asylumseekers.

The first goal must be to get the children in a safe place. Eventually, some may pass the rigorous test for asylum. Others may be considered for legal status as victims of traffickers, but many have no legal avenue and had none to begin with.

In many cases, children will face an immigration judge alone, without a lawyer and without a clue what is going on. The majority get orders of removal and face deportation immediately.

I have urged parents in the home countries that the risks are too great, the dangers too real, and the survival rate too low to attempt such a perilous journey, but let's be clear, adults on all sides of the border are failing when children feel they have no way to survive, other than risking their lives to cross thousands of miles.

I do not see the countries of Central America stepping up to take responsibility for the danger, dysfunction, death, and despair in their other countries, cities, and towns. The Congressional Hispanic Caucus told their embassies that in a very testy meeting yesterday.

Nor do I see the United States taking responsibility for the insatiable appetite for drugs on our streets—that, in most cases, fuel the drug trafficking, gangs, and desperation in Central America.

In Congress, we are quick to point fingers of blame—especially in an election year—but surely, we must accept some of the responsibility ourselves.

For decades, no realistic legal immigration options have existed for most people, and this breeds a clandestine network of smugglers that feeds on desperation and hopelessness.

Invading or propping up failing states on the other side of the world—like Iraq—has meant we have paid little attention to the failing states in our own backyard in this hemisphere.

Opponents of immigration and immigration reform mock the children on their radio shows and have even cooked up a new conspiracy theory that claims that President Obama has been calling these children to our country, so he can put more of them on welfare, so

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5499

that these children, who can never become citizens, will somehow be allowed to vote for him. It is outrageous.

We must not make light of this tragedy. These are children—desperate boys and girls who are being demonized after being brutally victimized by drug traffickers. Opponents of immigration are exploiting their desperation for political sport, but the stakes could not be higher for the Republican Party.

With only 6 legislative days before the July 4 recess, Republican leaders have little or no time to demonstrate compassion and understanding of the immigration issue, enact real border security, allow legal immigration that feeds our economy, and get people who have lived here for decades on the books.

Six days, Mr. Speaker, before this issue clobbers the Republican Presidential nominee in the 2016 election. You may have waited too long to act, but that is—as it always has been—up to you.

AMERICA NEEDS NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, headlined today in one of the papers: "Oil Prices to Rise as High as \$120 Per Barrel Due to the Iraqi Crisis."

Headlined a couple of days ago: "Oil at a 3-Month High on Iraq Anxiety."

This brings me back to an issue that I have spoken of many times throughout the years as a Member of Congress, that this Nation needs to have a national energy policy and, just like you would in a good investment portfolio, a diversified energy portfolio.

In the energy arena, I break it into two areas: electricity generation and transportation fuels. In electricity generation, we need to have the full range of competitive fueling technologies to have enough electricity at low prices to fuel and run our economy.

It is hot in Washington, D.C., today. A lot of air conditioners are on, and we want to be able to cool our homes at low prices. That means having a diversified energy portfolio: nuclear power, coal, natural gas, hydro, wind, and solar.

A debate on a diversified energy portfolio doesn't put all of your eggs in one basket. It allows you to have flexibility when there is a crunch or crisis in one of the other areas—likewise in the transportation fuel arena, especially with the crisis in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, who would have thought, after all these years, we would still be held hostage to high crude oil prices from an unstable region far away off our shores? Shame on us for not taking advantage of what we have locally and in the North American continent.

That is why we need to continue our focus on a diversified portfolio for liquid transportation fuels. Based upon

the premise of energy security, we should not be held hostage to countries that don't like us, who want to do us harm, who use our money to fund extremists, but here we are again, in that same position.

So what would a diversified liquid transportation fuel portfolio look like? Well, we know what it would look like. Let's make sure we use this new technology of fracking and take this crude oil and natural gas out of our ground and use that to fuel ourselves, not relying on other countries.

Let's finish the Keystone XL pipeline from our North American neighbors—the Canadians—who are our friends and allies, who will not be an unstable regime, but would be a loyal ally, as they have been for years and years and years.

Let's continue to move on a renewable fuel portfolio, use our agricultural resources in ethanol and soy diesel and beef tallow to ensure that there is a diversified portfolio, so that if any one sector is stressed, you have other sectors in the liquid transportation arena that can pick up the slack and make sure that we are never held hostage again by these foreign regimes.

It is very frustrating to go through this energy cycle where we think everything is fine, the world is at peace, and we start having debates about shutting down this diversified portfolio, only to be reminded—like we are right now—of unstable regimes that don't like us, that when they go into crisis, we all pay.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we remember energy security means energy security and a diversified portfolio on electricity generation and liquid transportation fuels. I hope we continue to make that message as we move through the legislative calendar this year.

NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress come to the floor to take the opportunity to urge that we deal with the great issues of the day—the failure of the House of Representatives to deal with climate challenge and global warming; to reduce senseless gun violence; and the crying need to rebuild and renew America and pay for the rebuilding—but there are also a range of other issues that don't, on the surface, appear to be quite that important, but play a critical part in the bigger picture.

Today, I would like to address just one small part of the bigger picture because this is National Pollinator Week, where we recognize the importance of honeybees and over 250,000 other species that pollinate our food and which create \$20 billion to \$30 billion in agricultural production in the United States every year. Honeybees alone are

responsible for pollinating one in every three bites of food we eat. Nearly 100 varieties of fruits depend on honeybee pollination.

While significant media attention has been devoted in recent years to the decline of honeybees, there is evidence of wild pollinator declines. Native bees are especially important to a number of iconic northwest agricultural products—such as cherries, apples, berries, as well as seed crops like alfalfa, canola, and vegetable seed.

I am proud that, in my community, we are home to the internationally-renowned Xerces Society, a nonprofit in the forefront of pollinator protection and habitat conservation, which harnesses the knowledge of scientists and the enthusiasm of citizens to implement conservation programs worldwide.

We saw in our community that businesses were stepping up to educate citizens and give pollinators a home. Last year, the rooftops of two local New Seasons Market grocery stores became home to several honeybee colonies—over 50,000 small pollinators—as part of the store's Bee Part of the Solution campaign.

Last summer, the Overlook neighborhood in my district started a project to become Portland's first pesticide-free neighborhood. Hundreds of households have committed to landscaping without the use of toxic chemicals to protect the habitat for not just bees, but wildlife as well.

These efforts are very important because the pollinator species and the livelihoods they support are suffering catastrophic loss, reaching an alarming 42 percent loss in recent studies.

□ 1015

American beekeepers have been consistently reporting severe colony losses of this magnitude for the last several years. The situation is serious and can have a devastating impact both on our food systems and the environment.

A certain class of insecticides, neonicotinoids, have been linked to damaging effects on honeybees and other pollinators, such as impairing their foraging and feeding behavior, disorientation, failure to find their way back to the beehives, weakened immunity, and interrupting the reproductive process.

A year ago, over 50,000 bumblebees died in Oregon as a direct result of an exposure to a neonicotinoid lawfully applied to trees for cosmetic purposes—the largest bumblebee kill on record.

Citing the mounting threats from these pesticides that honeybees and other pollinators now face and the importance and the value of the pollination process, last year Congressman CONYERS and I introduced H.R. 2692, Saving America's Pollinators Act. The bill would direct the Environmental Protection Agency to immediately suspend the use of the most bee-toxic neonicotinoids and review the impact

they have on pollinators and on the entire food chain and make a new determination about their proper application and safe use.

I hope that during Pollinator Week my colleagues will consider joining the 65 bipartisan cosponsors in this effort. While lots of major issues tie Congress into partisan knots, being able to protect the pollination process and its impact on the environment is a small step to protect the environment and is one that can actually bring us together in a low-cost, high-impact way.

I urge my colleagues to consider joining me in this effort.

HONORING MARVIN TEIXEIRA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in Carson City, Nevada, there will be a memorial service for former Mayor Marv Teixeira. Marv called Carson City home for about 50 years, coming from the bay area as the IBM typewriter—I know that is a phrase that is foreign to many of you—as the IBM typewriter salesman in the State capital of Nevada. During those decades, Marv set a blistering pace as a member of the community: husband, coach, businessman, public servant, lobbyist, and kind of a self-appointed Carson City gadfly.

Before he became what we friendly referred to him as the “mayor for life,” he was the unofficial youth sports czar for Carson City. He coached recreation league basketball, coached Little League baseball, founded the Pop Warner football league in Carson City. In this later role as the founder of the Pop Warner football league, he had the distinction of molding a then young DEAN HELLER, now a United States Senator from Nevada, into the football athlete that Senator HELLER didn’t become.

Once he was elected mayor of Carson City, his Portuguese charm was on full display. If he called you “pal” during a board of supervisors meeting, you weren’t a pal. He called for motions to adjourn when the agenda was completed by announcing, “We are out of Schlitz.”

He fancied himself a top-tier lobbyist for Carson City, both at the State level and here in the Nation’s Capital, because if lawmakers didn’t do what he thought should be done, he simply questioned your intelligence and, in a fatherly way, advised you to do what he wanted you to do, and please be quick about it.

Finally, Marv understood that he was both good-looking and a sharp dresser. In this role, he taught me an invaluable lesson as a public servant: when you are at functions, the proper thing to wear was not a tie, that you should wear a turtleneck; because, invariably, if food was being served at these functions and you happened to drip something down the front, you could, as Marv demonstrated to me on one occasion at a function, simply go to the

men’s room, turn the turtleneck around, put your sport coat back on, and come back as if nothing ever happened.

Carson will miss our mayor for life. When you go by the bypass, the hay barn as we like to call it, or Governors Field, think of our mayor for life, Marv Teixeira.

Rest in peace, Your Honor; and thank you, Coach.

OUR CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, for generations, this country’s infrastructure served as the backbone for our economic success. We dreamed big, we built bigger, and our economy flourished; but today our infrastructure is crumbling, and the growth of our economy is slow. Without serious long-term investments in our transportation infrastructure, we simply will not be able to compete in today’s global economy.

Over the past 50 years, as a share of our economy, our investment in transportation has shrunk by half. Europe now invests twice as much as we do in transportation. China invests four times as much. Over time, America has fallen into 19th place when it comes to the quality of our infrastructure.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in my hometown of Chicago, where 1,000 miles of road in the city of Chicago are in need of total reconstruction. 675 bridges in Cook County are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. North Lake Shore Drive is one of the highest accident locations in the State as a result of its aging infrastructure.

The CTA is a century-old transit system that desperately needs updates to keep up with increased capacity. Oh, by the way, the CTA in Chicago in 1 month carries more passengers than Amtrak does in an entire year.

All of these things will cost money, but the long-term economic benefits they will provide will far outweigh the upfront cost. The President likes to say that first-class infrastructure attracts first-class jobs, and he is right. Business needs strong infrastructure to grow. They need good highways and railways to move their products. They need reliable public transit to get their employees to work.

Infrastructure investment requires forward thinking; it requires long-term planning. The fact that Congress faces its lowest public approval ratings ever while this country’s infrastructure is crumbling is no coincidence. In my second year on the Appropriations Committee, I know all too well how little this Congress is investing in our future.

I became an appropriator to help bring much-needed funding back to my city and my State, but politics has replaced progress when it comes to my

committee’s once immense power of the purse. The important work of the Appropriations Committee to help cities and States fund critical infrastructure improvements has been stymied by the inability of this Congress to set aside our differences and look beyond the next election. We are trying to rebuild America’s crumbling infrastructure one year at a time, and we are coming up short. When did we decide that planning one year ahead was good enough? Name one successful business that operates this way.

We shouldn’t be forcing cities like Chicago and States like Illinois to make plans based on stopgap funding measures. We owe it to our constituents to provide a far-reaching plan that gives cities and States the certainty they need to plan ahead and invest in tomorrow. We should be empowering cities and States to make their own choices for their long-term success by providing them with the funding to do so.

It is time for this Congress to go big and plan for the long-term projects that will modernize our infrastructure, spur economic growth, create jobs. Remember, every billion dollars invested in infrastructure creates 30,000 jobs.

Congress will face an important test over the next few months. Over the summer, the highway trust fund will run out and soon MAP-21 will expire. Allowing Federal funding for transportation projects to run out would force States to stop ongoing projects, risking over 700,000 jobs over the next year.

The consequences for inaction are too great. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and finally enact a long-term highway bill that reforms the trust fund and makes it solvent for years to come, because as President Reagan said: rebuilding our infrastructure is an investment in tomorrow we must make today.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, each week I come to this floor to talk about ways that we can End Hunger Now. I have a simple premise that hunger is a political condition. We can end hunger now if we simply muster the political will to do so.

Over the past year, I have defended the SNAP program, formerly known as food stamps. I have discussed the importance of nutritious school meals and have sung the praises of the WIC program. The Federal antihunger programs are amazing. They are effective, and they are efficient and are preventing hunger from becoming worse than it already is.

The Federal antihunger programs can’t do it alone, at least not the way they are currently structured. Despite what many critics claim, the Federal antihunger programs are too meager,

and they still don't reach every hungry person in America. They fall under multiple agencies and departments and are not always connected, and they don't target the root cause of hunger, which is poverty.

As a result, we have seen the rise of many nonprofit antihunger organizations. The majority of these nonprofit organizations are food pantries that distribute food to needy people. But there are other innovative organizations that are doing amazing work.

One such organization is Share our Strength, founded by my friends Billy Shore and his sister Debbie Shore. Share our Strength is an amazing organization that is fighting hunger both through Federal and State policy and through programs that directly touch the hungry living in our country.

Their flagship program is the No Kid Hungry campaign. They are working in States across this country to develop statewide plans to end childhood hunger in those participating States. They tailor these programs to fit each State and are focusing through this program on the scourge that is child hunger.

Two more of their locally based programs are Shopping Matters and Cooking Matters. The Shopping Matters program teaches low-income families how to spend their food dollars. Whether it is cash or from an antihunger program, they are taught how to spend it wisely and how to purchase nutritious food with the limited money that they have. The Cooking Matters program teaches these families how to cook food in a healthy way.

These three programs show both how important it is to creatively attack the problem of hunger in America and highlight the ways the Federal Government is failing these low-income families by not doing more.

Just look at the No Kid Hungry campaign. Share our Strength is targeting States because the Federal Government hasn't created a national antihunger strategy. Share Our Strength turned to Governors because they are willing to do what Congress and the White House aren't—develop a plan. That is why I continue to call on this White House to do a White House conference on food and nutrition, to bring everyone together to develop a plan to end hunger now. Governors are doing this for kids. It is time that we do this for everyone.

Look at the Shopping Matters program and the Cooking Matters program. These programs exist because Congress has cut the SNAP nutrition education program, necessitating a private, nonprofit sector program to teach people how to shop for and cook nutritious food.

Share Our Strength is also conducting outreach and education in different ways. They promote and host events at the national, State, and local levels to combat hunger. These range from bake sales, to dining out events, to barbecues. These are not just feel-good events, Mr. Speaker. These are

events that come with teaching programs, programs that allow hosts to promote ways to fight hunger in ways that don't seem so daunting.

Mr. Speaker, there are many fantastic antihunger organizations both in Washington, D.C., and around this country. Share our Strength is one of these organizations that does fantastic work. I am proud of all of these groups that have stepped up to do what the Federal Government should be doing. I am proud of everyone who is banding together to fight hunger.

However, my goal, my ultimate goal, is to put Share our Strength and these other groups out of business, not because they aren't a great organization, but because they are no longer needed. But the only way to put these groups out of business is by ending hunger, and the best way to do so is to increase wages as well as expand SNAP and other nutrition programs. Until then, we need to ensure that no person in this country goes hungry. Until the Federal antihunger programs reach everyone they need to in the best possible way, we are going to need organizations like Share our Strength to help vulnerable populations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the failure of our government to make ending hunger more of a priority is appalling. To be indifferent, to blame poor people for being poor, as some in this House have done, is something that should make all of us ashamed. Republican leaders have attacked our antihunger programs and the White House, sadly, has been too timid. What we need is a war on poverty in this country, Mr. Speaker, not another war in Iraq. We can all do better. We can End Hunger Now.

□ 1030

COMMEMORATING ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 42nd anniversary of the signing of the Title IX Amendment to the Higher Education Act. As you know, Hawaii's own Congresswoman Patsy Mink authored this groundbreaking law, and it was later renamed the Patsy Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act. Congresswoman Mink was a true pioneer, advancing the legal status of women and girls in higher education. This law was the spark that ignited the fire of a larger cultural revolution—yes, a revolution, regarding the status of women.

While title IX is most famous for opening up opportunities for women in college athletics, it has had really a greater implication for women in higher education. This essential law banned colleges from preventing female students from enrolling in courses that were perceived to be male-oriented, such as auto mechanics and criminal justice, just to name a few. Title IX

also banned male-dominated professional schools like medical and law schools from limiting the number of women allowed to be admitted.

Patsy Mink, a former attorney herself, was committed to ensuring that women following in her path, like myself, would not have to face the same battles she did. For that we are all grateful to her. Mrs. Mink once said that: "We have to build things we want to see accomplished, in life and in our country, based on our own personal experiences, to make sure that others do not have to suffer the same discrimination."

Similar to the legislation she authored, Patsy Mink—the person—was a true groundbreaker in her own right. She served Hawaii and our Nation as the first woman of color and the first Asian-American woman elected into Congress. Impressively, she was the first Asian-American to seek the Presidential nomination for the Democratic party.

While title IX is responsible for many advancements for women in higher education, we know that there is still more work to be done for women at every level, including in our high schools. While serving in the Hawaii State senate, I was proud to vote for Hawaii's Gender Equity in Athletics law, which applies title IX in public high schools, and also to serve on the commission it created.

My commitment has not waned, and I recently cosponsored the High School Data Transparency Act, which is meant to help ensure equality for high school athletics. This fundamental bill would require schools to report critical data on funding and participation in boys and girls athletic programs, allowing school districts to better identify and rectify discriminatory disparities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring this crucial bill to the floor. The High School Data Transparency Act is an obvious partner to title IX, extending the spirit of the same law. We have an obligation to ensure that young women receive the same opportunities as their male counterparts at every level. I am committed to continuing the example set by my predecessor, Congresswoman Mink, and find inspiration in her words: "It is easy enough to vote right, but it is more often more important to be ahead of the majority, and this means willing to cut the first furrow in the ground and stand alone for a while if necessary."

In closing, I would like to share a meeting I just had yesterday with Kaili Higuchi, an eighth-grader from my alma mater, St. Andrew's Priory. Accompanied by her proud grandmother, she is here for National History Day. Her entry is a Web site on title IX. Kaili said a question asked was: Is title IX still necessary? Her answer was a resounding "yes." I believe Patsy would be proud of Kaili, and that 42 years later a young girl is continuing to educate and share title IX with others.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to join me in continuing the work of this committed visionary and powerful voice for equality. Please bring the bill to the floor.

WITNESS WEDNESDAY: FACES OF THE UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, in the United States, we have always had a bipartisan tradition of assisting fellow hardworking Americans who have fallen on hard times—until now. As they are looking for their next job, we used to make sure that they had assistance through unemployment insurance to cover their basic needs. That is why yesterday I stood with Congresswoman DINA TITUS, DONNA EDWARDS, GWEN MOORE, and nearly a dozen group advocates for what we are calling “Witness Wednesdays.” We all read stories about real people, submitted by them, who are struggling since their unemployment insurance has expired.

During that event, the National Women’s Law Center released a study with some very sobering statistics. Women, particularly older women, women of color, and women heads of households, are deeply affected by unemployment, as are their children by the lack of emergency unemployment insurance benefits.

Last year, in my State of Illinois, more than 140,000 children lived in households headed by a long-term unemployed parent. Also, in my State, by the end of the year, nearly a quarter-million people will be left without benefits they need to meet their families’ basic needs if we don’t renew emergency unemployment insurance.

These are real people and real families behind these numbers. These are people looking for jobs. I am going to read four stories from Illinoisans who have suffered setbacks as they look for the work they need—for us to renew unemployment insurance without any further delay.

Chris from Glenview, Illinois, says:

My husband and I will never recover financially and are praying we will not lose our home. I don’t think I will ever be able to retire, which is concerning as I have health problems. My 28-year-old son is still living at home because he was unemployed for over a year and is now serving coffee for minimum wage. He has a bachelor’s degree from Loyola University, and between his student loans and our parent loans, we will all be in debt for the rest of our lives. We are not alone. I know of so many who are struggling as we are.

Sue from Chicago says:

Due to new management at the HIV/AIDS agency where I worked for over 10 years, I was fired on May 23 in order for them to save money. I am 58 years old, have an autoimmune liver disease that limits me physically and requires regular health care from specialists, as well as six medications. I have no savings and retirement is a laughable mat-

ter. Because I had no warning that this was going to happen, I am now looking at having no income, no health, and having to move from Chicago to downstate Springfield, where the cost of living is much lower, though job prospects are dismal.

Dinah from Chicago says:

I am losing my hair, apartment, and car. I have borrowed from everyone in my family, hoping to pay them back soon. I have worked since 1993 and am now unemployed. Soon I will be in a shelter, car repossession, and bald. I am looking for work. I have been on several interviews but so far no luck.

And Celia from Chicago says:

I had a job interview in December 2013, about the time my unemployment ran out. I really wanted this job. It was not just the fact that I would be able to pay bills; the work would be rewarding. Unfortunately, the tension I felt when it was clear that I had to get this position, that there would be no extension of benefits, caused me to freeze up at the interview when asked to display my skills. This had never happened to me. I am usually the type to have no problems once I land the interview.

My confidence is way down. I am 62. I have no income and can’t seem to find decent jobs to even apply to. I have had to regularly take money out of my retirement savings in order to stay out of debt. The worst thing about this time after a good career is to feel dropped, disappeared, and no longer of value. There is a dry feeling, dusty, of everything being cheap and on sale and no way to get back. I am ashamed of being out of the work world.

Chris, Sue, Dinah, and Celia are 4 of nearly 5 million Americans who will continue to suffer and struggle if we don’t renew emergency unemployment insurance by the end of this year. We should vote and pass the bill to renew unemployment insurance without any further delay.

HAPPY JUNETEENTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today is June 19, an ordinary day in the lives of many, many Americans. That is why it is important to come to the floor and wish so many in our Nation Happy Juneteenth. For some, that may be a foreign terminology. But we are now in the 149th year of the 1865 Emancipation Proclamation for several States in the Deep South.

Those who know their history would say the Emancipation Proclamation was in 1863. They are absolutely right. But it took 2 years for States like Texas, Louisiana, and many others to, unfortunately, receive notice that the slaves were free. Two more years my fellow Texans, African American slaves, had to languish in the abomination of slavery because someone failed to think it was important enough to reach those boundaries and say we were free.

So it speaks very loudly to the reason I am an advocate and a fighter that justice must be maintained no matter who you are in this country. Those in Texas that, as I speak, are commemorating and celebrating Juneteenth

Freedom Day, are proudly acknowledging, not their fault that they did not know, not a joke, not humorous, but a sad statement which we in Texas and Southern States have turned into a joyful jubilee. We celebrate freedom wherever and however we can.

This Congress needs to be a promoter of freedom and justice. I join my colleagues in being appalled at the fact that we have not yet extended unemployment insurance for hardworking Americans. Let me say that again: unemployment insurance. It means that it is not a handout; it means that these are individuals who worked for weeks, months, years, decades. They have given back to America. Now they have fallen on difficult times.

Because of this leadership in this House of Representatives, we have not been able to put the extension of the unemployment insurance passed in the other body on the floor of the House. That means in my district that individuals who were rehabilitating themselves and were working and fell upon hard times because of the economy have no jobs and cannot get unemployment insurance.

When I met with some of them. A trained welder said, I want to work, I am between jobs, and he was literally driven to homelessness and walking the streets because we could not give him unemployment insurance based upon the fact that he has worked—or those who are now losing homes or not able to pay their rent.

Where is the mercy and justice? Are we following in the pathway of Juneteenth when we did not tell thousands upon thousands of slaves you were free? I thought America would not return to the devastation and dastardliness of injustice to anyone. Let us put unemployment insurance on the floor of the House and address the questions of Americans who have worked and contributed to society.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would argue that there is an injustice going on in Iraq. I traveled to Iraq many times during the raging war. I saw the valiant soldiers, many of whom maybe after I left were part of those who were casualties. I had in my office the list of casualties in the 18th Congressional District. I would be very mindful of going back into that quagmire.

What I would say is that America does stand for justice and democracy. We should have the position to treat Sunnis and Shiites and Kurds freely and justly, and that they have to come together and treat each other with respect. We should call upon Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, Jordan, and Yemen, we should give them support—the Arab League—to stand Iraq up and to tell this leader, who is a selfish leader, who is not in any way reflected on bringing people together, that he must bring people together. And we must say to the ISIS that the world will not stand for its violence and its horribleness.

And yes, we must say to those who are in the yesteryear, who were part of

last time's term, those who are former Vice Presidents and their extended relatives, that this is no time to cast dirt on President Obama, who has done an excellent job.

Americans come together when there is difficulty and tragedy. I am very disappointed in The Wall Street Journal article that wants to cast blame when people are dying in Iraq. Let's stand up and be united.

Just a few days ago, I came back from Nigeria, where the horrific Boko Haram is killing people and kidnapping girls. I ask my colleagues to please stand with us to not let the kidnapping of the Nigerian girls be a side story, Mr. Speaker.

As I close, I intend to introduce human trafficking legislation as a senior member of Homeland Security to address the question of the human trafficking of these girls, and girls and women of color, the highest population of those who are trafficked. We can do things together in America, and I ask us to stand together.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Mr. Rajan Zed, Universal Society of Hinduism, Reno, Nevada, offered the following prayer:

We meditate on the transcendental glory of the deity supreme, who is inside the heart of the Earth, inside the life of the sky, and inside the soul of the heaven. May He stimulate and illuminate our minds.

Lead us from the unreal to the real; from darkness to light; from death to immortality.

Fulfill all your duties; action is better than inaction. Selfish action imprisons the world. Act selflessly, without any thought of personal profit. Strive constantly to serve the welfare of the world; by devotion to selfless work, one attains the supreme goal of life.

May we become united with the all-powerful and all-knowing Lord, who dwells in the hearts of all, is the supreme goal of life and infinite peace and love. Lord, be kind to us with Your invisible form, lead us to eternal joy, fill our hearts with unending peace, and free us from all bondage. Abandon us not.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDWARDS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3230) "An Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. RUBIO, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1237. An act to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING MR. RAJAN ZED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to welcome Mr. Rajan Zed to offer the opening prayer before the U.S. House of Representatives.

A native of the State of Nevada, he attended San Jose State University in San Jose, California, my alma mater.

As president of the Universal Society of Hinduism and a senior fellow/religious adviser to the Foundation for Religious Diplomacy, he has advocated for religious freedom and tolerance throughout the world.

His contributions to the religious community worldwide led him to be invited by the president of the European Parliament in Brussels, Belgium, for a meeting to promote interfaith dialogue. He is particularly known for his work within the Roma community, acting as a voice for the human rights of the 15 million Roma in Europe.

That this body supports diversity of spirituality and cultures is a testament to our great institution.

For his continued spiritual leadership and for traveling from afar, I would like to thank Mr. Zed for leading us in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING CAROL DIXON

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Ethics and along with my colleague, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, the ranking member, and other members of the committee, past and present, we rise today to honor the life and work of Carol Dixon.

Every so often, through hard work, immense talent, and a zealous dedication to the mission of this body, a staffer becomes an institution of the House. Carol Dixon had achieved that status.

Known to many simply as the Ethics Lady, Carol's intelligence, candor, and infectious laugh made the House a better, more honorable place. As director of our Advice and Education section, Carol's command of the ethics rules was unmatched, as evidenced by the large number of Members and employees from both sides of the aisle who continually sought out Carol to specifically ask for her guidance.

Her sudden passing this weekend is a tremendous loss for both the Ethics Committee and the House.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING CAROL DIXON

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to honor the life of Carol Dixon.

Carol's public service was not just to the Ethics Committee, but to the entire House. Carol provided wise counsel to hundreds of Members and to thousands of staff. This House will miss Carol's sage advice and her deep institutional knowledge. The members and staff of the Ethics Committee will also miss our good friend.

While Carol loved her job and her co-workers in the House, most of all, Carol loved her family. We know this because she spoke of them warmly and often. Carol's mother and father and family members are here with us today. On behalf of all of the members and staff of the Ethics Committee, thank you so much for sharing Carol with us.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask for everyone to rise to observe a moment of silence in the House to honor the life and memory of our friend, Carol Dixon.

IRS EMAIL LOSS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe my ears when the IRS revealed last week that they have lost all of the emails that have been received and sent to outside individuals by Lois Lerner from 2009 to 2011.

Coincidentally, this timeframe is critical to the investigation into the IRS's targeting of Americans based on their personal beliefs. This excuse would be laughable if it weren't so serious.

Despite the agency's promise of full cooperation and full disclosure, we now know that is not happening. It turns out that the IRS knew since February, and they sat on this knowledge that they would not be able to produce Ms. Lerner's emails.

They waited 3 months, and then they buried it in a 27-page report and released it on a Friday afternoon news dump. This is not the transparency the American people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. While the House will continue its investigation to get answers, it is time for full accountability and the Department of Justice to step up to the plate and fully investigate the targeting of Americans by the IRS.

HONORING PASTOR MAURICE EDWARD BARNES

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sadness and also honor the passing of a great man, Pastor Maurice Edward Barnes. Pastor Barnes lived a life of service to both the church and community.

Born on July 30, 1945, to Charittie and the late Reverend Robert Barnes, Sr., he grew up in the Lake Como community of Fort Worth.

After completing his undergraduate studies at Texas Wesleyan University, Trinity Valley, and Southern Bible Institute, he answered his call to preach. For over 20 years, he was the faithful servant of God in the church in which he grew up, at the Zion Missionary Baptist Church on Horne Street in the Como community.

As a man who diligently served those around him, Pastor Barnes was not only a leader in the church, but also showed great leadership in organizations aimed at improving the community, like the NAACP.

My heartfelt sympathy to his wife, first lady Debra Watson Barnes; his children; extended family; and his friends.

Pastor Barnes made a positive impact on my life, and I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this great man.

IMMIGRATION CRISIS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a national crisis is happening right now in my home State of Texas. Thousands upon thousands of people from Central America are coming across our so-called southern border, and they are bankrupting Texas and wearing out our resources.

A recent headline reads: "Feds looking for babysitters to help with illegal immigrant kids." This is where our tax dollars are going. The border towns in Texas are literally overflowing with unaccompanied minors.

More than 162,000 people from countries other than Mexico have crossed the southern border of the United States since last October. That is more than a 100 percent increase from the previous year.

As my Democratic colleague Congressman HENRY CUELLAR said:

If we don't send the message that they can't come and stay here, this problem is going to continue.

It is going to get worse. The answer is simple: secure the border.

If we don't secure our border, our work in Congress is obsolete. Of course, the President is absent during this crisis, and it should be his number one priority: enforce the law of the land, and secure our border.

In God we trust.

FUNDING PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, pancreatic cancer is one of the deadliest cancers. A diagnosis of pancreatic cancer is often a death sentence. Of all of the patients diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, 73 percent die within the first year, most within the first 3 to 6 months.

I think we should reverse these alarming statistics and give hope to those who are affected by this disease. Fifty years ago, women were dying of breast cancer at an alarming rate; but today, with more scientific research, early detection techniques, and affordable health care, the survival rate is much higher. Women are fighting and beating breast cancer.

I think we should invest more funding for advanced research for pancreatic cancer that could save thousands of lives.

Pancreatic cancer, unfortunately, touched the life of my friend, Larry Clark, former mayor of Rancho Palos Verdes, California; but thanks to a suc-

cessful surgery and clinical trials, Larry is alive and well.

Now, he has dedicated his life to working with the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network to help others fight this deadly disease. They were here Monday, walking the halls of Congress, urging us for more research money.

My hope is that the awareness of this critical issue will be an impetus for action and improvement of the way we treat pancreatic cancer in order to fight the disease and save lives.

HONORING SERGEANT FAYNE HAYNES

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous American and proud son of Tennessee, Sergeant Fayne Haynes.

Mr. Haynes of Murfreesboro was only 20 years old when he entered the Army in 1942 at the height of World War II. He served on the front lines of Europe and was one of the first to land on Omaha Beach.

He also fought in the Battle of St. Lo, the Battle for Brest, and the Battle of the Bulge. He credits the good Lord for saving his life numerous times in combat.

Sergeant Haynes was eventually captured and spent 4 months in a prisoner of war camp, but managed to escape, aided by a German Army field map which hangs in his office today.

After the war, Sergeant Haynes became a successful businessman, operating the Haynes Brothers Candy Company in Murfreesboro. In 2000, Mr. Haynes switched his business to flags. Known as the Flag Man, he sells thousands of American flags each year.

Thank you, Sergeant Haynes, for your service. You truly embody the spirit of the Greatest Generation.

□ 1215

VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, one of the most precious rights we have as Americans is the right to vote. But every day it is becoming more difficult to do it.

Today is nearly 1 year after the Supreme Court's Shelby decision, which gutted provisions of the Voting Rights Act. States quickly moved to restrict voting rights. In fact, hours after Shelby, Texas announced its voter ID law would be implemented immediately. Thank goodness the Federal court blocked it.

Without these protections, minority communities will be disproportionately affected. The Voting Rights Act ensured equal access to the ballot box, and it protected voters like Rose

Thompson. Rose is 79 years old and has voted all her life, but this November she will likely be turned away. Rose was born at home in Jackson, Mississippi, and never received a birth certificate, so she can't obtain a voter ID as her State requires. Without an ID, Rose loses a fundamental right that was guaranteed to all Americans.

Now is the time for action. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Voting Rights Amendment Act and restore our ability to have a voice in this democracy.

VETERANS CONTRIBUTE TO HSA

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have heard the horror stories of our veterans experiencing long wait times, subpar care, or worse, no care at all at VA's across the country. While we can't fix a broken VA system overnight, we can do something now to help our brave men and women in uniform.

That is why I am introducing the Helping Veterans Save for Health Care Act that would allow veterans who receive care through the VA to contribute to a health savings account. Such savings could then be used by the veteran or their family.

Veterans want, need, and deserve more choices when it comes to saving for health care, particularly when our VA is failing to provide the care they earned. We must continue to put our veterans first, and we can start by making it easier for them to save through an HSA for quality care.

I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort. It is the right thing to do.

HONORING OFFICER SCOTT HEWELL

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Scott Hewell, a police officer in Stockton, California, who died as a result of injuries in the line of duty.

On May 28, Officer Hewell and his partner were headed to assist another officer with an armed suspect when their car crashed. Both officers sustained serious injuries, and Officer Hewell, sadly, died on June 11.

Only 33 years old, Officer Hewell was a graduate of San Francisco State University and joined the Stockton Police Department in September 2012. He was well-liked on the force. He trained at the Sacramento Police Academy and worked with the Sacramento Sheriff's Department.

Officer Hewell was the 11th officer to die in the line of duty in Stockton, the first since 1993. Our law enforcement officials risk their lives every day to work to protect ours.

Our community mourns the loss of Officer Scott Hewell, and our thoughts and prayers are with his family. I ask my colleagues to remember Officer Hewell and all the fallen officers and to thank our first responders for their service.

BORDER PATROL: PRESIDENT'S AMNESTY PROMISE CAUSES SURGE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors are surging across our southern border.

According to an internal Border Patrol report, the blame falls squarely on the President. The report shows that 95 percent of the illegal immigrants interviewed came to the U.S. to get a "free pass" from the President's announced amnesty policy. His failure to enforce immigration laws and his promise of amnesty by executive order entices these immigrant children to enter the U.S. illegally. The estimate for this year alone is expected to reach 90,000—15 times more than 4 years ago.

The President's solution is to issue public service announcements in Central America, but the administration's actions speak louder than their words. The President's pro-amnesty policies have caused this crisis. The real solution to the border surge is to enforce current immigration laws, not undermine them as the President has done.

RECOGNIZING ANTWON LAMON

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as kids across the country celebrate the end of the school year, I want to take a moment to recognize the outstanding students and educators who make our communities better. When good teachers, involved parents, innovative curriculum, and motivated students come together, our communities shine.

Today I recognize Antwon Lamon of Washington High in Chicago, who was recently recognized by the President at the White House Maker Faire. This event celebrated students whose innovative technologies and techniques will transform America's way of life.

Along with a team of pioneering Washington students, Antwon created "Baller's Life," a 3-D interactive game whose objective was to provide a non-violent educational experience that stimulates the minds of adults and children alike. It is so good, that even the President noticed.

Antwon's achievements include placing in Chicago's academic decathlon, completing rigorous AP courses, maintaining an honor average, all while competing on Washington's football,

wrestling, track, basketball, and volleyball teams.

As Antwon prepares for college at Northern Illinois University this fall, my alma mater, I am reminded that not only was the Second District made better by him, it has a brighter future because of students like him.

RESCUING THE CREW OF AQUA QUEST

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for the collective prayers of this Chamber to help bring my constituents back home to Tarpon Springs, Florida. Robert Mayne, James Kelly Garrett, Devon Butler, Nick Cook, Steve Matanich, and Michael Mayne are the crew of the Aqua Quest, a boat company hired to teach locals in Honduras how to safely scuba dive.

On a quest to do good, these men have been illegally detained without benefit of due process for 44 days and have spent several, as I said, several weeks in a dilapidated Honduran jail living in unacceptable conditions.

Together with my colleague, Congressman MIKE FITZPATRICK, we have urged the State Department and Honduran officials to work towards a quick resolution to free these men so that they may return to the loving arms of their families.

Your prayers are appreciated, and I have confidence that we will bring them home.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM SUMMER

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this year we mark the 50th anniversary of the 1964 Freedom Summer, when hundreds of Americans traveled to Mississippi to fight discrimination and advance voting rights and equality under the law.

Today I rise to recognize three Americans who gave their lives in that struggle: James Chaney, Michael Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman. On June 21, 1964, these three activists—one African American and two Jewish—were kidnapped and murdered for working to register Black voters.

Their lives, the lives of James Chaney, Michael Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman, were claimed by hate, yet their faith in equality and justice and the right to vote lives on today through the historic Black-Jewish alliance born out of the civil rights movement.

I proudly support honoring these three activists with a Congressional Gold Medal and would like to thank the Foundation for Ethnic Understanding for championing this cause.

For 25 years, the foundation has advanced the values shared by the Jewish

and African American communities, including tolerance, equal rights, and justice. As a Jewish American, it is an honor to fight for these values here in Congress today and every day.

RALLYING TO THE FAMILIES OF THE FALLEN AND WOUNDED

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the situation unfolding in Iraq is a tragedy.

Almost 4,500 fellow Americans made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq defending our freedom and fighting oppression and tyranny. More than 32,000 men and women who served our country in Iraq bear the wounds of war, and all who served had extraordinary pressures put on their families.

Unless you have lived it, one cannot begin to know the pain experienced by the families of the fallen and the wounded. Our men and women in uniform fought for an ideal. That ideal is freedom: the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the freedom to assemble and vote and make one's voice heard, freedoms like those we have right here in this Chamber. That ideal will never die.

During these difficult days, Mr. Speaker, let us make sure we are mindful of the sacrifice of so many and let us always rally to the families of the fallen and stand in solidarity with all of our veterans.

VA HEALTH CARE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate voted last week to pass comprehensive legislation aimed at addressing the long-standing issues within the Department of Veterans Affairs' health care system. Now it is time for the Republican House leadership to bring a comprehensive package to the floor.

With more than 8 million veterans turning to the VA for medical care each year, it is absolutely critical that we thoroughly address these issues in a timely fashion. That is why I commend Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK for introducing companion legislation to the Sanders-McCain bill to improve the quality of care within the VA.

Our veterans should not have to endure excessive long waits, tolerate canceled appointments, and question the quality of care they are receiving, nor should the persons reporting these activities be punished. The legislation would increase access to care while also improving on the quality of care, and it is something that we can act upon today.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation will be judged by how we treat our veterans. I urge this Congress to act swiftly on comprehensive legislation so that we

can bring real accountability—and some sanity—back to the VA.

HONORING KANE COUNTY'S EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Kane County Educator of the Year, Carol Mertes of East Aurora School District 131. For Carol, teaching is in her blood. Her grandfather was a principal and her aunt was a teacher in Chicago public schools.

Carol has been an exemplary first grade teacher for decades who has touched many lives through her exceptional teaching skills and care for her students. She has served on the East Aurora District's School Improvement Review Team, Language Arts Curriculum Council, Reading Leaders Committee, and the Reading Task Force.

Teachers like Carol have one of the hardest but most influential jobs in the country. They are in charge of shaping our future generations, and they have the ability to make a huge impact on our youth.

I am grateful for Carol's undying patience and care for our children in Kane County, ensuring that the impact is a positive one.

HONORING JUNETEENTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Juneteenth.

Each June 19th, we celebrate Juneteenth to commemorate the announcement of the end of slavery in the United States. Juneteenth is a celebration of African American freedom, but it is also an opportunity to reflect on opportunities for self-improvement and set goals for the future.

This past weekend, I was honored to take part in the 39th annual Juneteenth Festival in Buffalo. Started in 1976, this festival has grown over the years to become one of the largest of such celebrations in the world and has established its position as an important tradition within the Buffalo community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Juneteenth today to celebrate our Nation's rich African American history and express my thanks to those who organize these important community celebrations of culture and heritage.

IN FAVOR OF A STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, events in Iraq over the past week serve as a

chilling reminder of the fact that the world is not getting safer. I am disturbed by these events, but I am not surprised. Over the past few years, my colleagues and I have warned against our Nation's weakening foreign policy and the devastating defense cuts this President insisted on making on the backs of our men and women in uniform. The result is a strained military and a world where our enemies don't fear us and our friends no longer trust us.

On Monday, the USS *Mesa Verde*, one of our Navy and Marine Corps' amphibious warships in the LPD class, entered the Persian Gulf with 550 marines onboard. These ships have a long history of supporting our missions and responding to numerous threats all around the world. This LPD ship sitting in the Persian Gulf full of marines sends a clear message: we will not waiver in defense of American interests or protecting American lives.

I believe we need to keep sending that message. We must adequately fund our Nation's military, and we must provide for more ships like the LPD class amphibious warships so we can ensure the safety and security of our Nation and those who defend it.

□ 1230

NONDISCRIMINATION FOR LGBT FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen, President Obama will extend workplace protections to 14 million LGBT Federal contractors.

Thankfully, LGBT San Diegans are already protected by State law, but this is not the case for all Americans.

I applaud the President for doing the right thing. Now it is time for Congress to end discrimination for all workers.

California and 17 other States have shown that these protections aren't just the right thing to do, they are good policy and good business.

Discrimination has no place in government. Discrimination has no place in the work place.

It is past time for Congress to listen to the American people. The Senate has already passed the Employment Nondiscrimination Act. Let's bring ENDA to the floor and pass it today.

WISHING MARTELL AND RHONDA MENLOVE ALL THE BEST

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Utah has some large educational shoes to fill.

Martell Menlove, the State superintendent of public instruction in Utah, is ending a nearly four-decade career in public education. He has

served kids as a classroom teacher, a counselor, and an administrator in the Jordan, Tooele, and Rich districts, and he was my superintendent while I was teaching in the Box Elder district.

Twice he was named Superintendent of the Year in Utah before he joined the State office in 2009.

His wife, State Representative Rhonda Rudd Menlove, is also a career educator and is retiring after five terms in the Utah State legislature.

Utah is losing a great team who inspired kids. They will be missed. We want to wish both Martell and Rhonda all the best in the new adventures they will be taking together.

We thank you for what you have done for kids in Utah.

REMEMBERING JIM ROGERS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, Nevada lost a good man and I lost a good friend this past week when Jim Rogers lost his long battle with cancer at the age of 75.

Those who knew or briefly encountered Jim quickly realized that he had no fear. His business acumen, philanthropic generosity, and ferocious passion for learning made him a true game changer. Whether it was improving higher education or strengthening the integrity of the media, Jim never shied away from his convictions or backed down from his steadfast commitment to progress and quality. He started the conversation, directed the dialogue, and produced results that propelled Nevada, sometimes kicking and screaming, towards a brighter future.

My thoughts go out to his wife, Beverly; his son, his other family members, and the people who worked with him and for him at Channel 3. They brought the world into our living rooms every evening. We will miss him very much and so will they.

CONGRATULATING ACTUATED MEDICAL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Actuated Medical, Incorporated, a Bellefonte, Pennsylvania-based medical device company that focuses on state-of-the-art, minimally invasive instruments, for being selected by the Small Business Administration as a 2014 Tibbetts Award winner.

The SBA presents the Tibbetts award to companies who exemplify the best of the Small Business Innovation Research Program.

Recipients of the Tibbetts award are selected by a panel of judges based upon the economic impact of their innovation, how they supported Federal research and development needs, and

their ability to increase commercialization of Federal research.

As a former Member of the House Small Business Committee, I witnessed firsthand this woman's business enterprise grow from a young start-up to the top National Institutes of Health SBIR-funded company in Pennsylvania for 2013, placing them fifth in the country.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses remain the backbone of our economy, and innovators like Actuated Medical not only create devices that save lives and change the face of modern health care, they also provide good-paying, family-sustaining jobs in our local communities.

I lend my congratulations to everyone at Actuated Medical, Incorporated.

DEPARTURE OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT DR. ALUTTO

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about education today, probably because education is the economic engine of our future.

Ohio State University plays a pivotal role in K-Life education. It is located in my district, and it serves not only my district but the Nation.

Today, I rise to acknowledge Ohio State University's outgoing interim president, Dr. Joseph Alutto, a former colleague and a friend, and to welcome incoming president, Dr. Michael Drake.

Thank you, Joe Alutto, for your leadership in preparing our next generation of teachers, artists, medical, corporate, and community leaders. In an era where innovation in science and technology and creative entrepreneurialism will determine our global station in the world, it is critical that we have capable leaders at the helm of our education and research institutions.

I thank Joseph Alutto for his service to Ohio State University, the single-largest campus university in the country. God speed and good luck.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4413, CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 629 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 629

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market

certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-47. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 629 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 4413. This rule makes in order eight amendments which provide the opportunity for Members of the minority and the majority to participate in this debate.

The legislation before us today reauthorizes the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, known as the CFTC,

through fiscal year 2018, and makes important reforms to promote market stability and to protect end users from unnecessary regulations. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, we are here because we want to learn from the past, be prepared for the future, and to allow this organization to adapt as it needs to to produce better decisions and better outcomes in the future, and that is why Republicans are here today. This bipartisan bill out of the Agriculture Committee does exactly that.

Over the past 20 years, financial services companies have started to employ financial derivatives—historically used by farmers, ranchers, and utility co-ops to manage risk—as new types of investment vehicles. They are a part of the day-to-day life of millions of people across this country that help us to not only get better prices, but to be able to hedge against the uncertainty.

Today, the derivatives marketplace represents trillions of dollars' worth of futures contracts, swaps, and other similar financial instruments. In response to the incredible growth of the derivatives market, the CFTC has promulgated rules and regulations designed to promote fairness and stability throughout the economy directly in relationship to this activity.

Unfortunately, regulations have been written so broadly and with such inconsistency that many end users—such as farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and municipal utility companies that rely on these contracts for the delivery of critical grain and natural gas—are forced to comply with rules intended for sophisticated investment firms rather than the instruments on which they rely and use for their own trading and commodity work. Such blind enforcement of the law is not fair nor efficient and unnecessarily punishes small businesses that are trying to effectively manage their risk.

Simply put, as a direct result of the CFTC's regulations, American families are paying more for everything from a box of cereal to a new dishwasher to their monthly energy bills. In recognition of this fact, H.R. 4413 exempts end users from these regulations to restore fairness, to promote American companies, and to give them flexibility that they need to run their day-to-day operations and to protect consumers from unnecessary price increases.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been well understood by the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan basis. All the way to the top on both sides of the committee, there is an agreement about how to move forward with effectiveness, with efficiency, and to allow those end users to be able to have the market strategies available to them to hedge their own risk, and to understand the things that are in their own natural best interest, and that is stability of prices, a marketplace that they understand, and, perhaps more importantly, one which keeps American jobs in America and, secondly, that allows Americans to be able to in-

vest in America, from American-made products to American-made users.

What we are here to do today is to bring this commonsense piece of legislation to the floor on behalf of a bipartisan large group of members. It is common sense, it is pro-business, it promotes appropriate regulation of our Nation's derivatives market, it is well thought through. What this will allow is this House to be able to get on record, put themselves to where they can then go to a conference to meet with the Senate, if they believe it is the right thing to do, and move forward to make the CFTC even better than what it is today based upon the history and based upon where it wants to go.

□ 1245

The discussion we had at the Rules Committee was, on a bipartisan basis, very uplifting. I believe the effort that we are going to bring together with that legislation means that we can vote not only "yes," but have confidence that we have made better the things which we touch today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the rule for H.R. 4413, the Customer Protection and End User Relief Act, which reauthorizes through 2018 the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the CFTC plays a critical role in protecting market participants and our Nation's economy from fraud, manipulation, abusive practices, and systemic risk related to derivatives, both futures and swaps, as well as in fostering transparent, open, competitive, and financially sound markets.

However, H.R. 4413 contains several harmful provisions that impede the CFTC's ability to enforce existing derivatives rules and roll back meaningful reforms in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

Specifically, title II of this bill carves out the CFTC from the Administrative Procedure Act process for establishing regulations, which represents the most longstanding and broadly applicable requirements for Federal rulemaking and was written to bring regularity and predictability to agency decisionmaking.

Furthermore, section 203 of the legislation imposes burdensome cost-benefit requirements that likely serve only to prevent, delay, or weaken any rules that implement Dodd-Frank.

Current law already requires the CFTC and other agencies to conduct economic analyses pursuant to the Pa-

perwork Reduction Act, the Congressional Review Act, and the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

In addition, the CFTC is also bound by the Commodity Exchange Act to consider the protection of market participants and the public; the efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of futures markets; price discovery; sound risk management practices; and other public interest considerations, under the supervision of the courts.

The redundant cost-benefit requirements contained in H.R. 4413 will not only hamper the appropriate consideration and promulgation of new rules, but expose the CFTC to greater industry litigation.

Finally, H.R. 4413 threatens American taxpayers by deregulating foreign derivatives transactions. Under section 722(d) of Dodd-Frank, the CFTC is authorized to oversee derivatives transactions that "have a direct and significant connection with activities in, or effect on, commerce of the United States."

Section 359 of this bill exempts overseas derivatives transactions from regulation, creating a loophole in our system of regulatory oversight that could be gamed by large multinational swaps dealers.

Just 6 years ago, derivatives trading related to the activities of the corporate structure AIG and Lehman Brothers nearly brought down our economy and cost every American household more than \$50,000.

I related last night in the Rules Committee that we were there—Ms. SLAUGHTER and I and the chairman, Mr. SESSIONS—all of us—when Mr. Paulsen and Mr. Bernanke brought to us the notion on three or four paragraphs and two pages that this Nation was about to go bust.

It is clear that derivatives transactions outside of the United States pose real risks to United States financial institutions, yet instead of strengthening the CFTC's ability to effectively regulate derivatives transactions involving the foreign operation of U.S. banks, H.R. 4413 presumes that they will be governed by foreign rules, disregarding whether those foreign rules are adequate or if the trades will import risk back to the United States.

Moreover, this presumption can only be overturned after the CFTC and the Securities and Exchange Commission go to considerable procedural lengths to make a joint determination that a foreign host country's regulations are not broadly equivalent to United States regulations.

The futures and swaps markets are essential to our economy and the way that businesses and investors manage risk, particularly for farmers, hospitals, manufacturers, and certain utilities industries.

While I share my colleagues' concern regarding issues affecting many of

these end users, I believe that this legislation falls short of the goals of comprehensive Wall Street reform and ensuring that derivatives transactions do not contribute to another global economic crisis.

I also said last yesterday, in the Rules Committee, that I predict that if this measure were to become law, we could reasonably expect that we would have the same kind of financial crisis that we did 6 years ago.

Instead of creating new, heavy administrative burdens, we should further empower the CFTC to be able to carry out its responsibilities, including those under Dodd-Frank.

Just last week, House Republicans proposed to dangerously underfund the CFTC at 22 percent below the President's request, with an appropriation that will likely lead to either agency-wide closures or employee layoffs. This would make the already underfunded CFTC less effective at protecting consumers, end users, and investors.

Additionally, because this bill retroactively reverses rules that have already gone into effect and many of those that are in the pipeline, it increases uncertainty and costs to businesses and end users that will unnecessarily have the rules of the game changed on them.

I simply don't understand this logic. Reducing the CFTC's ability to effectively oversee these financial activities only increases the likelihood that we will find ourselves in another potentially disastrous situation.

Additionally, I would also like to take this opportunity to point out that several of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee share these concerns.

It was also pointed out by my colleague that this came out unanimously from the Agriculture Committee. It did in fact do so, but in the Rules Committee, we had the prerogative, if we so chose, to allow the Financial Services Committee to be able to make presentations that I believe—and in a bipartisan way—other Members, particularly those of the Financial Services Committee, believe should be a part of this discussion today. However, this rule cuts them out of the debate.

In fact, H.R. 4413 rehashes several earlier bills that Financial Services Committee members have previously voiced concern over, including H.R. 1256, the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act; and H.R. 1003, to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders.

The administration has also come out in opposition to the bill. We can't continue with more of the same failed partisan practices and effect a different outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida bringing up a few of the ideas and assertions that I believe that he thinks

are frailties in the bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I would like to do, if I can, is let him know that we had a full hearing yesterday and enabled our members time to read and understand and hear these ideas. We were assured yesterday by the chairman of the committee and the ranking member that this is a good process. We are not trying to do an end run around anybody.

Mr. Speaker, there is something that is well established, known as the Administrative Procedure Act. This is an opportunity for agencies to interact with each other through an agreement, whereby they consult with each other and provide information and procedurally be able to walk through who is doing what and how things might be done.

I don't think it means they always have to have consent. I don't think it means they always have to have agreement, but there is a process that goes on.

I would refer the gentleman to section 211 of the bill on page 18. Section 211 says quite clearly—no ambiguity here—that everything in this act is meant to comply with and give guidance to the Administrative Procedure Act, which means that there is nothing in here that says that the CFTC does not share its information, understand its rulings, work with the FTC, work with the SEC, work with anyone about those rules that they are going to promulgate.

As a matter of fact, it says that the CFTC does have the ability to do that, and instead of them making their own rules and regulations without working through the Administrative Procedure Act would be a mistake. It is authorized here in law.

Further, if one goes back to a later section, page 47 of the bill, section 359, for the Members of Congress that are sitting in their offices and interested in this and want to know, this bipartisan bill by two senior Members—by the way, a former chairman and the current chairman today—says, "Section 359. Cross-border regulation of derivatives transactions."

That means that, in a world market, we want to make sure that Japanese, Russian, Indian, German, whatever the marketplace holds for a commodity that we are talking about in particular, this would mean that, as the bill says:

Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodities Futures Trading Commission shall jointly issue rules setting forth the application of United States swaps requirements for the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act related to cross-border swaps and security-based swaps transactions involving U.S. persons or non-U.S. persons.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do the right thing. This is not about causing some market crash or failure. This comes from the Agriculture Committee, on a bipartisan basis, making sure that, in section 211 and section

359, they very effectively address exactly what we are being told we didn't do.

□ 1300

We are trying to have this government know what the right hand and the left hand are doing, not the reverse, and I believe it is simply not a true statement to say that we are not trying to accomplish this.

Look, we don't all have to agree on this, but on a bipartisan basis—unanimous out of the Agriculture Committee—they thought they did a pretty good product. I think they did a pretty good product, and my job is to come defend us on the floor. So, when somebody says you did something wrong, I say, "Read the bill."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the chairman, my good friend, that good intentions don't always manifest themselves in a positive way. I am sure before we had the recession that there were good intentions. My prediction is that, without appropriate regulation, we can reasonably expect that these same kinds of recessive measures might come into play. I recognize my good friend, the chairman, has his script together when it comes to something bipartisan coming out of the Agriculture Committee, but I also know that this is an end run around the Financial Services Committee, which also has germane interests in the particular legislation at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my very good friend and the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, how quickly we forget what got us into the economic mess in the first place.

I was here 6 short years ago when the recklessness on Wall Street triggered the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression and cost millions of hardworking Americans their jobs and their homes. Since then, Democratic majorities in the House and Senate have enacted reforms, known commonly as Dodd-Frank, to stop the worst of these abuses with the aim of preventing another economic meltdown. Obviously, since that time, copious American dollars have been spent, and legions of lobbyists have come in, to try to undo Dodd-Frank. This is the first of other bills that we will get that will do away with regulation. Unfortunately, the authorization passed out of the Rules Committee last night is a backdoor attempt to undo some of the crucial reforms and is a precursor to another financial crisis.

Why wouldn't the Rules Committee give equal debate time to the Financial Services Committee, which has real jurisdiction over what we are doing here today? Why would they disallow that?

It is because they didn't want anybody to hear it. If the Agriculture Committee were unanimous, I don't know what its reason was, but many Democrats and, certainly, those of us on the Rules Committee and others who are going to be here today want to be solidly in the "no" column because, if what we fear will happen happens, we want the country to know that somebody tried to stop it as there are crucial reforms that we talk about in this bill which are going to handcuff and obstruct the law enforcement officials who are charged with overseeing the markets and enforcing the regulations on Wall Street.

When we found out 6 years ago, I was a member of the leadership then and was chair of the Rules Committee. We got a message on Saturday afternoon. It was three paragraphs, which Mr. HASTINGS did a wonderful job of explaining, from Secretary Paulson and the head of the Fed, Mr. Bernanke. It was very short and quite succinct. Basically, if we did not provide them—the Treasury and the Fed—with \$800 billion by Tuesday—and this was Saturday—the financial services in the United States would be defunct. We would be finished.

This was pretty frightening because all we knew is that fancy things were going on on Wall Street and that mortgages were being chopped up and sold in pieces. I think they unloaded a lot of it onto Germany's Deutsche Bank. We not only affected our economy, but we affected other parts of the world. It was a disaster—people lost houses that they had spent their lives trying to get; children were displaced from their homes and from their schools; people were without their jobs—simply because they were playing tricks, passing paper back and forth to each other, and there was not strong enough regulation in this country for the people who did the oversight to even know what was going on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. This was one of the most awful things that we had ever gone through. We watched what happened to our neighbors and to those in other parts of this country where people were literally forced out onto the streets because of what Wall Street had done, not because of anything they had done. People who had paid their mortgages faithfully every single month suddenly found out that those mortgages were worthless, that their mortgages were more expensive to them at that time than their houses were worth on the market.

Why in the world would we have any attempt here to undo any of that? Those lobbyists and all of that money made their statements pretty clear.

On our side, we are trying to hold up the other side. We want to speak for those people who lost their jobs. We want to speak for those people who lost

their homes. We want to say to the small businesses that had no access to capital and went under that we are trying to protect your interests here.

Whatever happens, we know we don't have the votes—you have got them. We do know that this is a majority that hates regulation whether it is clean air or clean water. Whatever it is, get rid of it. Then you come back down here to Wall Street and know the effect that it has had. We haven't completely recovered from that recession. God knows we have not passed any legislation in the House of Representatives to create jobs or to make it any better. We do everything that we can just to benefit those people who have the money. We all know how this movie ends. If it moves forward as written, we are sowing the seeds for future disaster in this country.

Last night, at the Rules Committee, we called for a "no" vote, and we said specifically what we were doing. We wanted to be on record on our side as trying to protect the American public and their futures so that they have some confidence again in what they are doing. We would love it if banks would again stop passing paper back and forth to each other and would make loans and get people back to work. We, of course, were not able to do that as 2-9, I believe, was the vote. We will see what happens when this comes to the floor, as it certainly will. We just simply, as I said, want to make sure because, the last time this came up, we didn't have the opportunity to speak. We are a solid "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really do appreciate the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for coming down and taking her very important time.

I would, with great respect, remind her and my colleagues who are listening that the Agriculture Committee has jurisdiction over the CFTC, not the Financial Services Committee, which is why we are here doing this bill today.

I want to just say to the gentleman and the gentlewoman that, if they are unable to give time during the debate or now to their Democrat colleagues they would choose, I am sure they could come talk to us and ask for time, but I don't see anybody lined up here to come down and argue the point, because this is a bipartisan bill, because this is a commonsense bill, because this makes sense that we are trying to avoid problems by getting this administration and the commissions that are spoken about here to work together, to use the benefit of the knowledge of the past. This is not about deregulating or doing away with something or defunding somebody. That is just not the case.

The case is section 211 and section 359. The entire bill has been well vetted and well understood on a bipartisan basis. Mr. COLLIN PETERSON, the rank-

ing member, came with the chairman, Mr. LUCAS from Oklahoma. They sat there very succinctly and said they were going to work together. They were asking us to consider working together. We have had lots of bills, lots of appropriators. Just the other day, Armed Services, on a bipartisan basis, brought us their bill. I am sure there will be people who will fight that also. They will say that those darned Republicans just want to ruin this country, that they want to go back to the other ages.

Mr. Speaker, not true.

In fact, work that is done on our Appropriations Committee and work that is done, as an example, on the Agriculture Committee is done together to try and address the problems of their constituencies. They're the people who live in rural America—people who get up early, who go to bed late, who care about this country—who do the things that, I think, are all American, in my mind, including having their sons and daughters join our military and they are helping each other—good neighbors—and looking out for each other. That is what we are doing. That is what this is. This isn't to have a debating group about things that are wrong. It is about things that can be done right.

I would just say that, if the Democratic manager is unwilling to yield his time to Ms. WATERS, who is the gentlewoman who came up from Financial Services, she ought to ask a Republican if he will yield time, and it wouldn't surprise me if he would.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, through you, I would advise my good friend that we have no further speakers and that I am prepared to close at this time if he is.

In closing, what has transpired here is interesting. The Agriculture Committee had finished its product, and then it came yesterday to add provisions that in the final analysis are dealing with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Then my friend, the chairman, would argue that it is an agriculture bill. Clearly, it is smack-dab in the lane of Financial Services, and they were excluded. Yes, Ms. WATERS did come to the Rules Committee last night, and there is no requirement that she be here now, but what we could have done—we keep saying "last night," but it was late yesterday evening—is to let the Financial Services people participate in this debate—but no. What we have are the two people, the chairman and ranking member, who are given time with reference to this matter, and the Financial Services Committee is shut out of this debate. That is just plain wrong, and I believe most people know that.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4413 creates significant loopholes for derivatives by hamstringing the CFTC, and it undermines comprehensive financial reform.

Six years after the Great Recession, families are still struggling in this

country. As of last week, 3 million Americans have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since it expired in December 2013. I want to repeat that: 3 million Americans have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since it expired in December 2013.

After my friends finish their reconstitution of their leadership this afternoon, I would hope that their new then leadership would come down here and put something on the floor that would allow us at least to have a vote, up or down, as to whether or not people should receive unemployment compensation.

Other things that have expired, along with unemployment compensation that expired in December, are the tax extender provisions, which help individual families and small businesses invest. In the coming months—real soon—Congress is going to be faced with even more pressing challenges as our Nation's highway trust fund is expected to go 0.0—bankrupt—and the authorizations for Federal surface transportation projects will also expire. The Export-Import Bank and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act are set to expire. The House still has eight appropriations bills left to pass, and with each passing day of inaction on these items, we come closer to another economic crisis.

Republicans and Democrats must come together to prevent this from happening as well as to move our Nation forward on comprehensive immigration and tax reform, raising the minimum wage, protecting voter rights, and securing equal pay.

□ 1315

Let me go back through that. Securing equal pay, protecting voter rights.

I am personally tired of the suppression and oppression measures with reference to voting in this country. Why in the world would we want less people to vote than, under the circumstances, people that should be participating in this great democracy of ours?

And yet we have States, including my own, circumventing the process of voting, restoring, if you will, age-old problems having to do with voting rights.

How about raising the minimum wage?

Put something down here on the floor and stand up and vote for it or against it. But don't come in here and have everybody believe that you are moving this country forward.

I predict for you what is going to happen: 28 more days, 27 more days, are going to go through the rest of this process. There is going to be further obstruction from the majority in this particular House of Representatives, and then we will go out and we will have an election, and the American people will speak again to those of us that are in the House of Representatives.

Most of us are likely to be back here, and we will be right back here in what

is referred to as a "lame duck session," and we will hold that lame duck session, pass some kind of an omnibus bill, and be off into the sunset for the 2016 election.

Enough already. Stop pretending, and have people know that we are confronted with real problems in this country, and it is this institution that has a responsibility to attend to them.

The reauthorization of CFTC is both important and necessary. However, H.R. 4413 includes provisions that put the safety and the stability of the United States financial system at risk. Therefore, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman, my dear friend from Florida, for not only attending the meetings, Rules Committee meetings, that were directly related to this subject. It took some time yesterday. He was offered an opportunity and took us up on asking questions.

But I will tell you, not all of Denmark is rotten, Mr. Speaker. Not all of Denmark is rotten.

We are here today to put a bill on the floor to reauthorize the CFTC. We are not here for housing bills. We are not here for Wall Street bills. We are not here for all the problems of voter regulations. We are not here for all the problems of the world.

I am for world peace too, by the way. But that is not what we are here to do today.

What we are here to do is to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, through a bill that was worked through by the Agriculture Committee, on a bipartisan basis, where they bring people together and actually listen to ideas. And certain sections in here may have been written by a Republican, certain may have been written by a Democrat, but there was agreement that they saw the same direction.

What did we do?

We made sure we empowered, by recognizing the role of what we are reauthorizing for the CFTC, and gave them what we believe are the proper statutes and direction, which is what the Congress of the United States is supposed to be doing, giving direction, working in consultation, and we have done this over and over and over.

By the way, this is not a 3,000-page bill. This bill was read by Members of Congress before we passed it.

Section 211, right here, we want people to work together. We would like to ask this administration to please work together.

Oh, by the way, we included the Federal courts in here also, and we said, a person adversely affected by a rule of the commission promulgated under this act may obtain the review of this rule in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

So we included the court system in here. We went through a process to

make sure that we were dealing properly with a bipartisan answer to the past and to make us better for the future.

Oh, did we include other countries to where we want others in the world marketplace to know what we are doing? Yes, we did. Section 359, cross-border regulations of derivatives.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to do the right thing. We don't debate every day every bill. We do debate lots of bills. We are trying to do the right thing. We are trying to work together. We are even trying to give enough time.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Twelve and one-half minutes. My guess is that the gentleman from Florida had at least 12½ minutes. That is 24 minutes that we had available where, if there are other Members of the body that would wish to come down and participate in this debate, they can do just that.

I have not had anybody seek time. So I think the arguments are fair, but I think that they hold less water than what some assume.

What we are trying to do here today, the Republican majority, is to bring bills forward through regular order, through committees, where we know what we are doing, and we try and get things—try to get things done together. In this case, a successful rain dance has a lot to do with timing.

Well, the timing is right here today, Mr. Speaker, and we are right here on the floor with a bill. I see very little in terms of content where people want to come down and beat up the product. And the reason why is because this product is kind of like an American farm product—it is really pretty good. It really is a product of hard work, getting up early, going to bed late, being honest about it, trying to make things as efficient as they can.

So I am going to stand behind this product today. I am going to stand behind this product because I think they did a good job.

I will tell you that I think that our young chairman, FRANK LUCAS, is a great young leader. He is doing great things, and that is why I can say I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule, "yes" on the underlying legislation, and I can say with some 10 minutes left in time given me, and some time, about the same that was given to my Democrat colleague, I am going to yield back the balance of my time because I believe that the job we did was worthy and the product will show itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1635

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4413, CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 629) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purpose, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 184, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Amodei	Broun (GA)	Collins (GA)
Bachmann	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Bachus	Bucshon	Conaway
Barber	Burgess	Cook
Barletta	Byrne	Cotton
Barr	Calvert	Cramer
Barton	Camp	Crawford
Benishke	Campbell	Crenshaw
Bentivolio	Cantor	Culberson
Billirakis	Capito	Daines
Black	Carter	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Cassidy	Denham
Boustany	Chabot	Dent
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Bridenstine	Coble	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roe (TN)	Maloney, Sean	Perlmutter	Sinema
Duffy	Kingston	Rogers (AL)	Matheson	Peters (CA)	Sires
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)	Matsui	Peters (MI)	Slaughter
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Rogers (MI)	McCarthy (NY)	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Ellmers	Labrador	Rohrabacher	McCollum	Pingree (ME)	Speier
Enyart	LaMalfa	Rokita	McDermott	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rooney	McGovern	Price (NC)	Takano
Fincher	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen	McNerney	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
Fitzpatrick	Latham	Roskam	Meeks	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Fleischmann	Latta	Ross	Meng	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rothfus	Michaud	Ruiz	Titus
Flores	Long	Royce	Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Forbes	Lucas	Runyan	Moore	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)	Moran	T.	Van Hollen
Fox	Lummis	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Sanford	Nadler	Sarbanes	Veasey
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Scalise	Napolitano	Schakowsky	Vela
Gardner	McAllister	Schock	Neal	Schiff	Velázquez
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert	Negrete McLeod	Schneider	Visclosky
Gerlach	McCaul	Scott, Austin	Nolan	Schrader	Walz
Gibbs	McClintock	Scott, David	O'Rourke	Schwartz	Wasserman
Gibson	McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Pallone	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Sessions	Pascarell	Serrano	Waters
Gohmert	McKeon	Shimkus	Pastor (AZ)	Sewell (AL)	Waxman
Goodlatte	McKinley	Shuster	Payne	Shea-Porter	Welch
Gosar	McMorris	Simpson	Pelosi	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Gowdy	Rodgers	Smith (MO)			
Granger	Meadows	Smith (NE)			
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Smith (NJ)			
Graves (MO)	Messer	Smith (TX)			
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Southerland			
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Stivers			
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Stockman			
Guthrie	Miller, Gary	Stutzman			
Hall	Mullin	Terry			
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)			
Harper	Neugebauer	Thornberry			
Harris	Noem	Tiberi			
Hartzler	Nugent	Tipton			
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Turner			
Heck (NV)	Olson	Upton			
Hensarling	Owens	Valadao			
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Wagner			
Holding	Paulsen	Walberg			
Hudson	Pearce	Walden			
Huelskamp	Perry	Walorski			
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Weber (TX)			
Hultgren	Pittenger	Webster (FL)			
Hunter	Pitts	Wenstrup			
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland			
Issa	Pompeo	Whitfield			
Jenkins	Posey	Williams			
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)			
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Wittman			
Jolly	Reichert	Wolf			
Jones	Renacci	Womack			
Jordan	Ribble	Yoder			
Joyce	Rice (SC)	Yoho			
Kelly (PA)	Rigell	Young (AK)			
King (IA)	Roby	Young (IN)			

NAYS—184

Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Holt
Bass	DeFazio	Honda
Beatty	DeGette	Horsford
Becerra	Delaney	Hoyer
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jeffries
Bonamici	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Engel	Kennedy
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kildee
Capps	Esty	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Farr	Kind
Carney	Fattah	Kuster
Carson (IN)	Foster	Langevin
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Chu	Gallardo	Levin
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Garcia	Lipinski
Clay	Grayson	Loeback
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Cohen	Grijalva	Lowe
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham
Conyers	Hahn	(NM)
Cooper	Hanabusa	Lujan, Ben Ray
Courtney	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Crowley	Heck (WA)	Lynch
Cuellar	Higgins	Maffei
Cummings	Himes	Maloney,
Davis (CA)	Hinojosa	Carolyn

NOT VOTING—17

□ 1701

Messrs. HONDA and HOYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Messrs. STIVERS, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, CULBERSON, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. HALL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 4903, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-481) on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise with many of the women of the House, both Republican and Democrat—the members of the Congressional Women's Softball Team—to share with our colleagues that, last night, at the Sixth Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game, the Members beat the press and took back the trophy.

Now, unbelievably, the press seems to be absent. They want to cover us on

everything else, but they seem to be absent in observing these proceedings. We are so proud to report to you that we didn't just beat them, but we beat them badly—10–5.

We were able to raise the most that we have ever raised for the Young Survival Coalition. In total, over the last 6 years, we have raised just over \$500,000 for the Young Survival Coalition, which helps raise awareness and takes care of young women who are facing breast cancer. I know all of you know by now that I am a breast cancer survivor myself. I was diagnosed at 41, and so this is so personal for me.

I want to thank all of my teammates who have become my sisters and friends. The best thing about this game, besides that we were able to raise awareness for young women all across this country, are the friendships that we all formed and that many of us know would not ever have been made without our playing together on this team. It was so much fun for such a good cause.

Actually, what we would like to do before I turn it over to my cocaptain, Mrs. MOORE CAPITO, is we would like to ask Coach Nat to come join us at the front because she never gets the recognition that she deserves. We love her so much. Natalie gave us such incredible skill-building drills this year that it really made a difference. Our bats were hot, and our fielding was great. We had very few errors, and we jelled as a team.

If I can just say one thing before I turn it over to Mrs. MOORE CAPITO, it is that we are really so proud of the fact that this is a bipartisan team, and, hopefully, we set an example for how it really is possible to set aside politics and work together. We are very proud of being able to do that. Many of us work together in the Chamber now that we have played together on the field, so we hope that we can continue to set an example and make sure that we can, as much as possible, put aside politics so we can do things together for the country.

With that, I yield to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), my cocaptain.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my cocaptain, and I would like to thank the Members of the Senate who played with us as well. It was wonderful.

You all will be happy to know that we did not exploit the youth and inexperience of the press too much, because we had several grandmothers on the team, and for the poor folks who aren't grandmothers, I felt a little sorry for them.

I would like to call down our other coach, Mr. ED PERLMUTTER, who helped us every morning when we got up.

I would also like to give special recognition to two new members of the team this year—Katherine and Jaime. They did great.

To our Members who did not play with us this year, they were dressed

and cheering right by the sidelines, so thank you all for coming.

Thanks to all of you who came out and supported us. Thanks to all of you for supporting such a great cause.

Sorry we beat you—not really.

We are on to next year because we do enjoy it. It is a labor of love because we are up early in the morning in the wind and in the rain. Thanks so much for all of the support that you give us.

Thanks, everybody.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 4870, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 628 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4870.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1708

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4870) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 18, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 141, line 4.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

An amendment by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 292, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—130

Amodei	Green, Gene	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)
Barber	Hall	Neugebauer
Barletta	Hanna	Olson
Barr	Harper	Palazzo
Barrow (GA)	Hensarling	Paulsen
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Benishek	Holding	Peters (MI)
Bentivolio	Hudson	Petri
Bilirakis	Huelskamp	Pitts
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Pompeo
Braley (IA)	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Broun (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Brownley (CA)	Jones	Rooney
Buchanan	Jordan	Roskam
Burgess	King (IA)	Rothfus
Campbell	Kingston	Royce
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Rush
Chabot	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Labrador	Salmon
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scalise
Costa	Lamborn	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Denham	Loeb	Sinema
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Maffei	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Marchant	Southerland
Duffy	Massie	Stockman
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Takano
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Enyart	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberi
Farenthold	McCaul	Tipton
Fincher	McClintock	Walberg
Fleischmann	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Garrett	McIntyre	Webster (FL)
Gibson	McKinley	Welch
Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Rodgers	Wolf
Goodlatte	McNerney	Yoder
Gosar	Meadows	Yoho
Gowdy	Messer	

NOES—292

Aderholt	Capps	Courtney
Amash	Cárdenas	Cramer
Bachus	Carney	Crawford
Bass	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beatty	Cartwright	Cuellar
Becerra	Cassidy	Culberson
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Chaffetz	Davis, Danny
Bishop (UT)	Chu	Davis, Rodney
Black	Cicilline	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Boustany	Clay	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	DeBene
Brooks (AL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Dingell
Bucshon	Cole	Doggett
Bustos	Collins (GA)	Doyle
Butterfield	Collins (NY)	Duckworth
Byrne	Connolly	Edwards
Calvert	Conyers	Ellison
Camp	Cook	Ellmers
Cantor	Cooper	Engel
Capito	Cotton	Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Capuano
Kirkpatrick
Lankford

Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Polis

Rangel
Richmond
Ryan (OH)

□ 1713

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 242, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—179

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Schradler
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Petree
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivoglio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black

Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor

Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford

Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Westrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Capuano
Kirkpatrick
Lankford
Mulvaney

Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Richmond

Ryan (OH)
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1718

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 233, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—187

Amash	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Barber	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Petri
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capps	Israel	Rahall
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Keating	Sanford
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schneider
Cleaver	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lee (CA)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis	Sinema
Cummings	Lipinski	Sires
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Speier
DeGette	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Takano
DelBene	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Maloney, Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Doggett	Massie	Titus
Doyle	Matheson	Tonko
Duckworth	Edwards	Tsongas
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
Enyart	McCollum	Vargas
Eshoo	McDermott	Veasey
Esty	McGovern	Vela
Farr	McNerney	Velázquez
Fattah	Meeks	Visclosky
Foster	Meng	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Wasserman
Fudge	Miller, George	Schultz
Gabbard	Moore	Waters
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Gibson	Neal	Yarmuth
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	
	Nolan	

NOES—233

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Collins (NY)
Bachus	Buchanan	Conaway
Barletta	Bucshon	Cook
Barr	Burgess	Cooper
Barrow (GA)	Byrne	Cotton
Barton	Calvert	Cramer
Benishek	Camp	Crawford
Bentivolio	Campbell	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Cantor	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Daines
Black	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	Delaney
Boustany	Chaffetz	Denham
Brady (TX)	Coble	Dent
Bridenstine	Coffman	DeSantis

DesJarlais	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rokita
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rooney
Ellmers	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Latta	Roskam
Fincher	LoBiondo	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Long	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Lucas	Royce
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ruiz
Flores	Lujan Grisham	Runyan
Forbes	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry	Luján, Ben Ray	Salmon
Fox	(NM)	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Schock
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Schweikert
Gardner	Marino	Scott, Austin
Garrett	McAllister	Scott, David
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gibbs	McCauley	Sessions
Gingrey (GA)	McClintock	Shimkus
Gohmert	McHenry	Shuster
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Simpson
Gosar	McKeon	Smith (MO)
Govdy	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Granger	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Southerland
Green, Gene	Meehan	Stewart
Griffin (AR)	Messer	Stivers
Griffith (VA)	Mica	Stockman
Grimm	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Terry
Hall	Miller, Gary	Thompson (PA)
Hanna	Mullin	Thornberry
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Harris	Neugebauer	Tipton
Hartzler	Noem	Turner
Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Upton
Heck (NV)	Nunes	Valadao
Hensarling	Olson	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Walberg
Holding	Paulsen	Walden
Hudson	Pearce	Walorski
Huelskamp	Perry	Walorski
Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Weber (TX)
Hultgren	Pittenger	Webster (FL)
Hunter	Pitts	Westmoreland
Issa	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Jenkins	Pompeo	Williams
Johnson (OH)	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)	Wittman
Jolly	Reed	Wolf
Jordan	Reichert	Womack
Joyce	Renacci	Woodall
Kelly (PA)	Ribble	Yoder
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Yoho
Kingston	Rigell	Young (AK)
Kinzinger (IL)	Roby	Young (IN)
	Roe (TN)	

NOT VOTING—11

Capuano	Moran	Rangel
King (IA)	Mulvaney	Richmond
Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)
Lankford	Polis	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1722

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs.
WALORSKI) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 238, noes 179,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—238

Aderholt	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amodei	Granger	Pearce
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Perry
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Peters (MI)
Barber	Green, Gene	Peterson
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Barr	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barrow (GA)	Grimm	Pitts
Barton	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hall	Pompeo
Bentivolio	Hanna	Posey
Bilirakis	Harper	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Reed
Black	Hartzler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brown (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hurt	Rokita
Byrne	Issa	Rooney
Calvert	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Cantor	Jolly	Rothfus
Capito	Jones	Royce
Carter	Jordan	Ruiz
Cassidy	Joyce	Runyan
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Salmon
Coble	Kingston	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Scott, David
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cook	Latham	Shimkus
Cotton	Latta	Shuster
Cramer	Lipinski	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Sinema
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Southerland
Denham	Marchant	Stewart
Dent	Marino	Stivers
DeSantis	Matheson	Stockman
DesJarlais	McAllister	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duffy	McCauley	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Turner
Ellmers	McIntyre	Upton
Farenthold	McKeon	Valadao
Fincher	McKinley	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walberg
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walden
Fleming	McNerney	Walorski
Flores	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Messer	Westmoreland
Fox	Mica	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Garcia	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Gardner	Mullin	Womack
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Woodall
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Yoho
Gibson	Noem	Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Nunes	
Goodlatte	Olson	
Gosar	Palazzo	

NOES—179

Amash	Braley (IA)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Beatty	Bustos	Ciçilline
Becerra	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bera (CA)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Clyburn
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cohen
Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)	Connolly

Conyers	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Cooper	Keating	Pocan
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kennedy	Quigley
Crowley	Kildee	Rahall
Cummings	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Rush
DeFazio	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	T.
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sanford
DelBene	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis	Schakowsky
Dingell	Loeb	Schiff
Doggett	Lofgren	Schneider
Doyle	Lowenthal	Schrader
Duckworth	Lowe	Schwartz
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Engel	(NM)	Serrano
Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Esty	Lynch	Sherman
Farr	Maffei	Sires
Fattah	Maloney,	Slaughter
Foster	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Frankel (FL)	Massie	Speier
Fudge	Matsui	Swell (CA)
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	Takano
Gallo	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Grayson	McGovern	Thompson (PA)
Green, Al	Meeks	
Grijalva	Meng	
Gutiérrez	Michaud	
Hahn	Miller, George	
Hanabusa	Moore	
Hastings (FL)	Moran	
Heck (WA)	Nadler	
Higgins	Napolitano	
Himes	Neal	
Hinojosa	Negrete McLeod	
Holt	Nolan	
Honda	O'Rourke	
Horsford	Owens	
Hoyer	Pallone	
Huffman	Pascarella	
Israel	Pastor (AZ)	
Jackson Lee	Payne	
Jeffries	Pelosi	
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	
Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)	

NOT VOTING—14

Capuano	Lankford	Richmond
Ellison	Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)
King (IA)	Nunnelee	Schweikert
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Wittman
Labrador	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1726

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON

Mr. COTTON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to transfer or release any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the individual's country of origin or to any other foreign country.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arkansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would very simply prohibit the use of funds in this legislation from being used to transfer detainees at Guantanamo Bay to their country of origin or any foreign country.

There are two main reasons why this amendment is necessary, both related to the President's action in trading five senior Taliban commanders for Private Bowe Bergdahl.

First, he has proven that section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act is inadequate; and, second, we need to review conditions of the release of the Taliban Five.

On the first point, this Congress granted the President, last year, expanded authority to release detainees from Guantanamo Bay, conditioned on 30 days' notice to the Congress, as well as certain conditions.

The President abused that authority by releasing the Taliban Five without notification, even to the so-called Gang of Eight, the senior leaders of both parties in both Chambers, the senior leaders of both Intelligence Committees in both Chambers.

The President, having duly signed the National Defense Authorization Act into law with those restrictions, but then did not obey those restrictions, did not claim his core article II constitutional powers to override them. Therefore, it is imperative on our institution to reclaim, on principle, our constitutional authority.

Second, the Taliban Five have been released into the country of Qatar. We need to take a year to review the conditions of those released. As many of you have seen, they appear to be moving about freely in the country of Qatar without any restrictions on their movement, absent the requirement that they remain in Qatar.

This would allow them—senior commanders, mind you—to communicate freely with Taliban on the battlefield against our troops in Afghanistan. We should be able to take at least 1 year to see if such conditions are adequate to support the release of such hardened terrorist commanders.

What does this amendment not do? This is not a permanent ban on transfers of detainees from Guantanamo Bay, nor does it authorize indefinite detention. It simply says we will take a 1-year pause to evaluate the conditions under which five senior Taliban commanders were released and to reassert our constitutional prerogatives.

Who are these detainees? They are not goat herders who were innocently swept up by the American military, nor are they foot soldiers or couriers. These are the worst of the worst, 149 hardened terrorists, which Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay says 120 of are high risk to return to the battle.

In fact, just this week, a former Guantanamo Bay detainee was arrested in Spain, recruiting for the Islamic States of Iraq and Syria, the terrorist

group that is currently rampaging through both Syria and Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, stand up for your honor as a coequal branch, stand up for our national security, and stand up for the safety of your constituents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman would have a restriction, and I would point out, after today's vote, this would now be the fifth restriction relative to the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. While the gentleman suggests that it is not a permanent ban, it is a mantra of let's do nothing.

These are human beings, whether we want to admit that or not, and to simply continue, after 13 years, to do nothing is wrong. We are a Nation of laws.

I believe the continued operation of Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

Also, we are debating an appropriation bill, and people ought to understand that we are spending \$2.7 million annually per inmate at Guantanamo Bay, which is about 35 times more than the cost of an inmate at a supermaximum Federal prison in the United States.

I would also point out that the United States has transferred 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during the Bush administration and 88 transfers occurring during the Obama administration.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in support of the gentleman from Arkansas, TOM COTTON's amendment, which would prohibit any funds from being used to transfer or release any of the prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay.

We are a Nation of laws, and we need to make sure we follow those laws. I support this amendment for a litany of reasons, chief among them is that it sends a clear message to the President that he cannot circumvent Congress and that he, the President, cannot override the law of the land.

He should have notified Congress 30 days prior to releasing the five prisoners in exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl. The implications of this release will have a far-reaching impact on the national security of the United States.

Just recently, as the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) pointed out, Spanish authorities arrested a former

Guantanamo Bay detainee on suspicions of running a terrorist recruitment network.

The Director of National Intelligence has said that, by January of 2014, about 29 percent of the 614 detainees released from the prison at Guantanamo Bay had returned to violence.

Our brave men and women in uniform have fought too hard and have sacrificed too much to have the President release these detainees who will likely return straight to the battlefield. We understand this, and our constituents understand this. I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this strongly, too.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out, relative to the gentleman's suggestion that we need to make sure the laws of the land are followed, that that is exactly what we do in this bill.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN had an amendment in the full committee, which I supported and spoke on behalf of, given the recent transfer of Taliban prisoners by the administration, and the fact is, in section 9015 of the bill, as printed and pending, it says:

No more than 15 percent of the funds made available may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense provides the congressional Defense and Intelligence Committees with a detailed spend plan for the funds provided.

Essentially, the chairman's initiative that I supported—and the committee voted for—fences that money off to make sure the law is followed. This amendment is unnecessary.

I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the gentleman from Indiana on numerous points, this is the fifth restriction that this Congress has undertaken.

If it were to pass, it simply shows the judgment of this Congress, the people's representatives, that these remaining 149 detainees are too dangerous to be cavalierly released into a country without adequate constraints or without notification to Congress, as the law that the President signed demanded.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. There are some facts that need to be put on the table that are inconsistent with what has been suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas. 18.6 percent of the people that were released by the Bush administration were "confirmed" recidivism cases, but it needs to be made clear that the Obama administration has released 95 people, and five of them have gone back to the battlefield.

Now, we don't want anyone to go back to the battlefield. There are 149 detainees still at Guantanamo. Fifteen are clearly the worst of the worst. Nobody is talking about transferring them, ever; but among them are a number of Muslim men who are inno-

cent of any act against this country or our allies who were in the wrong place at the wrong time and were kidnapped by bounty hunters.

Only 5 percent of the prisoners held at Guantanamo were actually apprehended by U.S. forces, and as many as 86 percent were delivered to coalition forces in exchange for a bounty of millions of dollars per head.

There are 78 people who have been cleared for release by the Department of Defense, and they are still under detention. That is a travesty. That is not right. That is inconsistent with everything we believe and stand for in terms of American jurisprudence.

I think the gentleman has made it sufficiently clear by now that many of us know that the political and legal expediency of this detention center at Guantanamo has not been worth the cost to America's reputation around the world, nor to the erosion of our legal and ethical standards here at home.

For far too long, over the course of this war, we have let our fear and anger triumph over our commitment to the rule of law, and every day that we continue to hold these men without charge, we diminish ourselves and cede our moral authority in the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is wrong. We need to exercise our judgment. Not all are the same. Not all should be there. Some should be tried in our courts, and this country has the ability to try and prosecute them.

□ 1745

Mr. COTTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. COTTON says that by this amendment, Congress recognizes the danger presented by these detainees. But legislative bodies have no right to make such judgments about individuals. Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison or punish people on mere accusations. Just because the government or Congress labels someone a terrorist doesn't make him one. The government must be required to prove the accusation in court. That has always been a bedrock American principle until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. By what claim of right do we do this?

How can we be sure we are punishing actual terrorists and not innocent people when we hold no trials? Guantanamo should be closed and its inmates either tried or released. It is beyond time to close Guantanamo to end this shame on American justice.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would simply say that the 149 terrorists left at Guantanamo Bay are not goat herders, they are not couriers, and they are not even foot soldiers.

They are bomb-makers, they are commanders, and they are intelligence experts who have killed American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines around the world.

Yes, there have been releases in the past, but many of those release were of less dangerous terrorists. The Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay says 120 out of 149 of the remaining detainees are at high risk to return to the battlefield. That is over 80 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote to put a pause on the President's lawless release of the Taliban Five from Guantanamo Bay.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this bill and provisions therein which underscore that a free, independent, and democratic Ukraine is in the interests of liberty everywhere, most especially the European continent, which largely shares America's constitutional values and respect for the rule of law.

The road ahead will not be easy. Ukraine faces enormous challenges in transitioning to a democratic society as Russia eats away at her eastern provinces and now begins to sabotage her internal assets. The incomes of ordinary people in Ukraine have dropped significantly. Consumer inflation for the year is up 16 percent at the same time the hryvnia has depreciated sharply, forcing private consumption to drop precipitously and further pushing GDP to decline. Life for ordinary citizens has become increasingly unsympathetic. Liberty hangs in the balance. With winter's approach, economic pressures will further mount as Russia restricts gas supplies to Ukraine.

This is a time for attention to Ukraine, which holds enormous potential to be the world's breadbasket in this 21st century, if only political conditions are stabilized to allow a better future to be built for all.

One powerful dimension of Ukrainian society most often ignored by Ukraine's former leaders and by the world community is Ukraine's village women. Despite all obstacles, they continue to produce nearly half the food

that that nation's citizens eat. In village after village, on plots that are small and open pastures, these stalwart women—many of them grandmothers—toil, using simple hand tools, worn out handcarts, wearing old boots, and planting seed and plants whose germ-plasma is nearly worn out. Their time-worn, horse-drawn wagons need tires to navigate the rough back roads. Their dwellings often lack water and indoor plumbing. Life is survival, and it is hard.

Empowering Ukraine's women to lighten their load and make their task a bit easier would be one important step our country and world leaders could take to allow Ukraine to transition through these delicate years to a better future.

For these reasons, the Appropriations Committee included language in the Defense bill directing the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the enactment of this act describing additional assistance that the Department may provide to Ukraine, including out of its surplus warehouses.

The goal of our humanitarian efforts is to empower the women of Ukraine, who, despite enormous obstacles, literally hold their families and that nation together. It is to use humanitarian shipments from our country, from government surplus—anywhere in the world we can acquire it—to simply provide items to help them with their food production and preservation. Give to these village women: good seed, buckets, wheelbarrows, gloves, boots, shovels, scythes, hoes, rakes, plastic on rolls, fencing, carts, used tires that will fit their horse-drawn wagons, simple canning equipment for putting up fruits and vegetables, drying equipment, scissors, hand shovels, grass clippers, pruners, loppers, saws, hammers, small hoop houses, hose, rope, and string. And while we are at it, how about some shortwave radios so they can connect to the world beyond their meager circumstances?

We anticipate with other provisions in this legislation States with lift capacity, such as Ohio, can arrange Department of Defense humanitarian shipments through their National Guard Partnership for Peace programs to transport the above-mentioned agricultural tools and supplies to the Ukrainian women in their villages through charitable networks in that country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recognize this important inclusion in this bill. I thank the chairman of our committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, the ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and all freedom-loving people everywhere for understanding the vital consequence of these provisions at this moment of history. I would like to include for the RECORD an article entitled "Ukraine Faces Hurdles in Restoring Its Farming Legacy."

[From the New York Times, May 27, 2014]
UKRAINE FACES HURDLES IN RESTORING ITS
FARMING LEGACY
(By Danny Hakim)

ZIBOLKY, UKRAINE.—Like many of her neighbors in this old Soviet collective farm, Maria Onysko prefers to be paid in grain instead of cash for the modest plot of land she rents out.

"I have two cows and four pigs, many chickens," said Ms. Onysko, 62. "So we use it for them."

After the breakup of the Soviet Union, farmland in newly independent Ukraine was divided among villagers, acre by acre, creating a patchwork of agricultural endeavors that are often inefficient or unprofitable. Some land is rented to fruit growers, grain operators or large-scale farming businesses. Some locals work small plots on their own. Some acreage sits fallow, stuck in legal limbo after the owner has died.

Ukraine was once the breadbasket of the Soviet Union, known for its rich soil where grain, sunflowers and livestock flourished. But farming production dropped sharply in the chaotic decade after the collapse of communism, and recovery has come in fits and starts. Production is only now returning to peak levels of the 1990s, stymied by the corruption, red tape and inefficiencies that have plagued the broader Ukrainian economy for years and left the villagers living humble existences.

Restoring Ukraine's farming legacy will be crucial to the success of the country's newly elected president, the billionaire businessman Petro O. Poroshenko. Such efforts would go a long way toward fixing Ukraine's economy and reducing its dependence on Russia. Agriculture once accounted for nearly 20 percent of the gross domestic product; it is now roughly 10 percent.

The potential became clear last year when a strong harvest helped Ukraine avoid a drop in output. "It was just because of agriculture," said Pavlo Sheremeta, Ukraine's minister of economic development. "Otherwise, it would have been a decline."

Against the backdrop of the crisis with Russia, Western interests are pressing for change. The European Union is moving forward with a plan to bolster trade by lifting custom duties on Ukrainian agriculture. As part of a deal with the International Monetary Fund for up to \$18 billion in loans, the country's government must push through business reforms that would help alleviate the problems with farming and other businesses.

The hope is that such initiatives will also bolster the confidence of foreign investors as the crisis abates. Big multinationals have expressed tentative interest in Ukrainian agriculture, but they have largely remained on the sidelines, unwilling to invest in an industry hampered by structural deficiencies and, more recently, the uncertainty with its eastern neighbor.

"If cheap capital comes in along with foreign investment, and you have a good government without roadblocks, Ukraine can close to double its production in the future," said Roman Fedorowycz, a Ukrainian-American who returned here years ago and now runs a farming company that grows mainly corn, sunflowers and soybeans.

Even small improvements would make a big difference in a highly inefficient industry starved for money. While roughly 70 percent of Ukraine's land is considered suitable for agriculture, it has not been fully cultivated. The country's yield per hectare of grain is about half that of the United States, according to the World Bank.

Change won't come easy, given the challenges. Previous governments have tried to

restrict what crops farmers grow and when they rotate crops, as well as limiting exports. Some state inspectors lack cars to conduct on-site inspections, so farmers must bring grain to them before shipping.

Selling farmland is also forbidden in Ukraine, a legacy of its communist past. So fields remain cut up "like chessboards," said Georgiy Vaydanych, land manager for Agrokultura, a Stockholm-based agricultural company that rents 173,000 acres in many such villages. "For the moment we have 40,000 active landlords," Mr. Vaydanych said. "Forty thousand!"

Making matters worse, paperwork is costly and many villagers never officially inherit the farmland after their parents die. "There is uncertainty on how to farm this land, because we have the dead souls in the middle of our fields," Mr. Vaydanych said, in a reference to Nikolai Gogol, whose 19th-century classic, "Dead Souls," is required school reading here.

Even as the crisis in the east intensifies, life in the agricultural west remains much the same.

A dirt road straddling tilled fields leads into this village, with potholes so deep that drivers zigzag past each other. There are horse-drawn carts, roosters crowing, elderly women in kerchiefs and a church painted pale green topped by bulbous spires.

Few in this pro-European area of Ukraine are nostalgic for Moscow. Still, Oleg Gusak, head of the village council, said life had not improved.

"When it was a collective, the level of life was better," he said, explaining that it was once a larger operation that harvested crops, had livestock and made clothing, furniture and jams.

"People even came from other regions, because we had so much work," he said, adding, "Now, it's not the same."

Trouble raising capital at reasonable prices makes it difficult to start or expand farms.

"I have to pay up to 12 percent if I borrow in euros," said Taras Barshchovsky, an entrepreneur who founded T.B. Fruit, which makes fruit juices and whose rented orchards cover thousands of acres. He has expanded into Poland, where he said he could borrow for less than 3 percent.

"Those who work with Ukrainian banks in hryvnias," the national currency, "they pay up to 20 percent or more. I don't believe you can profit and return money on that percentage," he added.

And while other former Soviet bloc neighbors like Hungary, Romania and Poland began easing their land sale restrictions after joining the European Union, Ukraine has repeatedly delayed lifting its moratorium, considering the move politically risky in its agrarian society. In 2013, the government of Viktor Yanukovich, the deposed Ukrainian leader, extended the moratorium until 2016, after he expected to stand for reelection.

"I'm afraid if I sell my land in the future my children will say their old grandfather drank away all their money," Hrynychshyn Myroslaw, 62, said as he cleared a willow field near another village.

With a laugh, he added: "It depends how much you will pay me. If there are enough zeros, you can pay me."

Volodymyr Baran, 43, a tractor mechanic, said he would never sell his six acres: "The land is our bread."

Such dynamics deter foreign investment, which has been tepid for years. Despite some interest from China and multinationals, large agricultural enterprises tend to be Ukrainian owned, and recent prominent deals have been less than they seemed. For example, Cargill paid a reported \$200 million

for a stake in UkrLandFarming, an agricultural holding company. But a Cargill spokeswoman emphasized that the shares were collateral for a loan rather than a long-term investment.

The rules make "it so much more difficult to understand, and to bring in investment," said David Sedik, a senior official at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. "It's not that a foreigner or a company has to buy the land, but it breeds opaqueness in the sector. You need transparent land laws."

At his office, Mr. Vaydanych pulled out a village map and showed how its 2,500 acres were divided up among 507 villagers.

"Every field is split, by little, little plots," he explained.

Being a land manager requires a political touch. Mr. Vaydanych goes from village to village handing out favors, fending off competitors trying to outbid his rental contracts.

A village chief, he said, "may call us and tell us, it's the wintertime, we have a lot of snowfall, so give us a forklift to clean the road. O.K., well, we do that."

"He may say this electricity substation is broken so we need urgently to repair it, or he's calling because the water pump at school broke, so we replace it," he said. "That's the commitment that comes with the land."

"I wouldn't be surprised by any request," Mr. Vaydanych said. "It is about keeping everyone happy. That's my work."

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to join with the ranking member in commending you for this colloquy and for the purpose of the colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we share, love, and represent a number of Ukrainian Americans, and we know their plight, and we salute your efforts. This is an important focus that you have brought to our attention.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you so very much for your openness to this, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Ranking Member, thank you for allotting me the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her service and for her commitment to her constituents, to her country, and to the Ukrainian people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, or transfer, or to prepare or plan for the retirement, divestment, or transfer of, the entire KC-10 fleet during fiscal year 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply states that none of

the funds made available by this act may be used to retire, divest, or transfer—or to prepare to retire, divest or transfer—the KC-10.

During my time in Congress, I have been a strong supporter of the Air Force's new tanker, the KC-46A. We must bring a new tanker online, but during the transition, it is critical that we are able to meet all mission requirements.

This is why I am strongly concerned by the Air Force's proposal to do a possible vertical cut of the KC-10 tanker and retire it. Having a mission capability shortfall by eliminating the newest tanker currently in our inventory while the KC-46A comes online is simply unacceptable.

As many of you are aware, I am proud to have Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst in my district, and my colleague Mr. GARAMENDI has Travis Air Force Base in California, which are both home to the KC-10. This is not parochial. It is an air refueling and air mobility mission readiness issue.

The KC-10 platform has more than proved itself as a workhorse in support of air refueling and air mobility in Iraq, Afghanistan, our homeland defense, and other missions as called upon.

Unlike other tankers in our inventory, it can refuel Air Force, Navy, and international military aircraft with its dual boom and hose-and-drogue systems. The KC-10 itself can also be refueled while in flight, helping extend our global reach.

Most importantly, this aircraft is critical to providing an air bridge across the Arctic, Atlantic, and Pacific routes to support our combatant commanders.

This amendment sends a message to the Air Force and the DOD that Congress remains committed to active oversight of our air refueling mission platforms and sufficient capacity to support our warfighters.

I want to thank the chairman, the members of the subcommittee, and the staff for working with me on this important amendment. I would particularly highlight our appreciation for the strong support Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has shown for the KC-10 platform, and his concern for ensuring there is no mission gap for our military's air refueling needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUNYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for raising this important issue. We believe this proposal to be an extremely risky proposition because the KC-10 provides a particularly vital link in the air bridge that enables global operations of our Armed Forces.

We could not have done what we did in Afghanistan and Iraq without this vital link, and to retire the entire fleet

would be a huge mistake. This is the only tanker that currently uses the boom to fuel Air Force aircraft and the basket to refuel the Navy and Marine Corps fleet. So it is darn important.

I appreciate the work the gentleman has done to bring this to our attention. We have included, of course, language in our bill which reemphasizes the importance of the KC-10 to national security.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition and would certainly at the outset compliment the gentleman for his concern about the KC-10 and also for his remarks about the performance of the aircraft as well as the value to our country. That is not in dispute, and that certainly is not the reason I am on my feet now.

But the amendment, I believe, would reserve a specific element in the Department of Defense force structure. The practice of the committee and in our bill has been to avoid protection of specific weapons systems or bases and to leave the Department flexibility as far as a path going forward, particularly as far as restructuring units, as well as retirement of programs. This language does not comport with the general concepts of this bill.

I would also point out an issue similar to this relative to a transfer of an airlift wing that was in one State of this great country, and the Department proposal that it be transferred to a different State in this country was debated in committee relative to the reporting of this bill, and we had a vote on that issue, and the committee voted against interfering with the decision that the Department had made relative to their military judgment. Therefore, I would urge the rejection of the gentleman's amendment with all due respect to the capabilities of the KC-10.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments on that. And I will just tell the committee that I have had many conversations with the Air Force about this exact issue, and to be able to take a capability away from what we can do in our global reach and not have a legitimate answer in the near future I think would be devastating to what we can do and how we can project power globally.

So the readiness issue has not been answered, and I think this is a step in the right direction to make sure that our national security is at the forefront. So, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out sections 8107 and 8108.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1800

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes to explain that my amendment would allow the U.S. military to transfer to their home countries the 77 detainees who have been cleared for release by the intelligence community and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to bring those not cleared for release to the United States to be charged, tried, and sentenced.

The Sergeant Bergdahl exchange has brought this issue again to center stage, but the fact is that, if we had dealt with these individuals in a responsible and legal way, we would not be in this situation discussing the merits of the decision to release five of them.

For 12 years now, Guantanamo has operated outside of a legal checks of the American judicial system, serving a physical reminder of the gap between the principles that define us as Americans and our willingness to abandon those principles in the name of national security.

With the final withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan this year, the continued indefinite detention at Guantanamo enters a new stage. We will no longer be at war, and the current Authorization for the Use of Military Force will expire.

So we have to ask ourselves: Do we have the legal authority to hold these enemy combatants indefinitely? Now is the time to either transfer or bring these men to trial—now—while we can still do so on our own terms, while we can give the Defense Department the legal authority it needs to make the right decisions about these prisoners.

It is costing us \$2.7 million per detainee, per year, versus \$34,000 at a maximum security prison in the United States. More than 300 individuals convicted of crimes related to international terrorism are currently incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons in the United States, with no escapes or attacks in attempts to free them.

The indictment and capture of Ahmed Abu Khattala for his role in the Benghazi attack is a great example of our ability to deal with high-profile terrorists swiftly and safely.

Mr. Khattala will not be brought to Guantanamo to become yet another

symbol of U.S. hypocrisy. He will be brought to the United States to answer for his crimes in a Federal court and punished in accordance with the laws of this Nation. I have every confidence in our legal institutions to bring Mr. Khattala to justice.

General Michael Lehnert, who oversaw the opening of Gitmo has said that its continued operation “has helped our enemies” and makes “a mockery of our values.”

It is time to put an end to this by supporting this amendment, and let me just use one more quote. In the words of the family members of the 9/11 victims, the current system is “immoral, unlawful, expensive, counter-productive, unnecessary, and has failed to deliver justice for the 9/11 attacks.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I would first like to recognize Mr. MORAN's service on our committee. As just exhibited, in the full committee, he is truly a passionate man, and I must say he has been consistently passionate on this issue, but despite his passion and his reasoning, I stand in opposition to his amendment.

The provisions contained in our bill are the same as current law, and they have been carried in some form since fiscal year 2010, in both the appropriations bill and in the Defense authorization bill. Quite honestly, they need to remain there.

The provisions we carry ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are judged to be the most dangerous will never be brought into our homeland, where U.S. citizens could be threatened. There is a pretty strong and enduring consensus—bipartisan consensus—in Congress that Guantanamo Bay should remain open, that the detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason, and that no facility should be built in the United States to house them.

As everyone here is aware and as it has been mentioned in earlier debate, a number of detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real. We haven't quite left Afghanistan. The threats there are real.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I ask the House to give it a strong negative vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, we are holding 154 people at Guantanamo, 77

of whom have been cleared for release. That is to say they have been found guilty of nothing, are thought to be guilty of nothing, and have been judged not to pose any danger, but nonetheless, they are not released.

There is no reason and no right for us to hold them further. The others should be brought to the United States and tried in a secure facility, tried for their offenses.

Madam Chair, I wonder which of our colleagues doesn't believe in the American system of justice. I wonder which of us does not trust our own American courts. I wonder who among us does not believe in the Bill of Rights, who does not believe in the right to counsel or that people should have an opportunity to have their guilt or innocence established in court.

What we have at Guantanamo is a system that is an affront to those beliefs and to the United States. In the last decade, we have begun to let go of our freedoms bit by bit, with each new executive order, each new court decision, and each new act of Congress.

We have begun giving away our right to privacy, our right to our day in court when the government harms us, and with this legislation, we are continuing down the path of destroying the right to be free from imprisonment without due process of law.

The language in this bill, without this amendment, prohibits moving any detainees into the United States or releasing any at all and guarantees that we will continue holding people indefinitely, people who may not be terrorists, who may not be enemy combatants, some of whom we may suspect to be terrorists, none of whom have been proven to be terrorists, none of whom have had a day in court.

We will continue to hold them indefinitely without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for, contrary to any notion of due process.

Mr. COTTON says that this Congress has judged that these people are dangerous people. This Congress has no right, under the Constitution, to make such a judgment. That is called the bill of attainder and is specifically prohibited.

People to be found guilty must be found guilty in a court, not by a legislative body. Because of this momentous challenge to the founding principles of the United States that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law and certainly may not be deprived of liberty indefinitely without due process of law, we must close the detention facility at Guantanamo now, in order to restore our national honor.

This will afford the detainees no additional constitutional rights. The Supreme Court has already ruled that detainees at Guantanamo have the same constitutional rights at Guantanamo as they would if they were brought here.

They should be brought here. They should be tried in a Federal court,

where they can be convicted if guilty and acquitted if innocent and not wait for years for military tribunals which have succeeded in convicting nobody at trial at all.

We must restore the honor of the United States and eliminate this exception to our traditions and to our rule of law and to our rule of justice.

Just because we think or somebody in the government thinks that somebody is the terrorist does not mean that that person is a terrorist—he may or may not be—and it does not mean that he does not have the right to his day in court.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, what about justice for the victims of those who died on September 11, 2001? What about justice for those five detainees that were released the other day in the prisoner exchange, how is there justice there?

They were among the worst of the worst. We need to keep the provisions in this bill. I urge a strong “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy regarding the Navy's littoral combat ship. The Navy's littoral combat ship represents the future small surface combatant for the United States Navy. This program is in its infancy, but has, so far, cleared many hurdles and is well on its way to becoming an integral part of the fleet.

The Navy reduced the budget request from four ships in fiscal year 2015, as they projected last year, to three ships. Mr. Chairman, your bill has further reduced the program to a recommended level of two ships.

Mr. Chairman, wouldn't you agree that the LCS is an important part of the Navy's future fleet?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me first salute the gentleman from Alabama for his strong advocacy on behalf of the littoral combat ship, and let me say that the littoral combat ship plays an extremely important role in the future of the Navy's fleet.

In fact, the ship represents nearly one-sixth of the 306-ship fleet the Navy

has expressed as its stated fleet requirement.

During markup of the bill, the committee spent as much time, if not more, on this issue than any other. In the end, we were extremely concerned with the strong words expressed by the Secretary of Defense with respect to the small surface combat requirements that these ships must have.

Since the littoral combat ship does play a vital role, we want to make sure we are buying the correct version. That is why we slowed the production.

However, we recognize the importance of the industrial base—very much so—and we certainly don't want to let that in any way stagnate, so we have provided funding for two ships to bridge the gap until the Navy can verify the requirements and incorporate them into the production line.

I do recognize that this is an important program for your community, and you have been a remarkable advocate. You have been on my case for quite a long time, and I am hugely admiring of your passion and determination.

I want to assure you that we will continue to work with you to address your concerns. We will continue to monitor, as we proceed to conference with the Senate, and we will work with the gentleman to ensure we adopt the right policy for our national security and the industrial base, including a very important shipyard in the gentleman's district in Mobile, Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your attention to this matter. I look forward to working with you and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, as well as Chairman ROGERS, as we move toward conference.

The Navy has been unequivocal in its support for the LCS, and as you say, the LCS plays an extremely important role in the future of the Navy's fleet. It is vitally important the Congress not lose sight of that and that I not lose sight of the importance of this shipyard to my district.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I have amendment No. 31 at the desk, preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purposes of conducting combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I rise today, remembering 12 years ago when I stood on this floor and offered an amendment with the same purpose as the amendments I offer this evening: to prevent a war with Iraq; to keep our young men and women—our troops—out of harm's way; and to be prudent with taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, as well as ensuring our national security.

We are all familiar with the reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place. We must not let history repeat itself. Calls to be dragged back into a war in Iraq must be rejected because the reality is there is no military solution in Iraq.

I want to applaud the President for reiterating that again today and for making it clear that he does not want combat troops on the ground in Iraq.

This amendment would not allow funding for combat operations. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were inflamed, unfortunately, when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account respect for the entire Iraqi population.

□ 1815

The change Iraq needs must come from Iraqis, rejecting violence in favor of a peaceful democracy that represents all and respects the rights of all.

Our job is to continue to promote and support regional and international engagement, recognition of human rights and political reforms, support for women and children, and religious freedom.

Madam Chair, after more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives, and hundreds of billions of dollars, the American people are rightfully war weary. The American people are not interested in repeating the mistakes of the past. A recent poll found that 74 percent of the public is opposed to sending combat troops into Iraq.

This amendment would not impact the President's ability to protect U.S. personnel or our Embassy. We must do that. It does not impact the President's ability to act if there is a direct or imminent threat to our national security. As the President cited in his recent notification to Congress, doing so would be consistent with his responsibilities to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad.

Finally, it does not impact the President's ability to send assistance to gather intelligence or advisers and trainers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I withdraw my reservation, and I seek the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, what is occurring in Iraq is complicated and dangerous and violent.

This is a complicated issue that the gentlewoman seeks to address with multifaceted policy ramifications that really cannot be fully debated in an amendment in this short period of time.

The situation in Iraq remains highly complicated, very dangerous, and does, I believe, and many believe, pose an imminent threat to U.S. and allied interests, particularly regional security; witness the fact that the President has sent over a number of advisers to either protect the Embassy or work with the Iraqi military.

This amendment, in my judgment, goes too far as it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands, i.e., the Commander in Chief's hands, in navigating the complicated situation we face related to threats emanating from Iraq, recognizing that half of the country is now in the hands of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

We have to be realistic. What this amendment would do is to remove any possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstance, even if such engagement would be in the best interest of our own country or allies. For example, this would preclude the U.S. from providing any assistance to the Iraqi Government to defeat a terrorist group inside Iraq, and it appears we may be on the verge of doing exactly that.

Given the ever-changing dynamics in Iraq and the rising terrorist threats coming from within Iraq—and again, almost half the country is in the hands of terrorists—this is a very ill-advised amendment, and I strongly oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, just to clarify, all this amendment does is it would not fund the combat operations in Iraq.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Lee amendment. The American people have invested 10 years of precious blood and treasure into this conflict. The simple truth is that the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi Army have failed to win the confidence of their own people. The fact is, the army has cut and run, leaving behind valuable equipment, and the fact is we have no friends in this conflict. It is time to get out and to stay out.

Thank you, Representative LEE, for your amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, this amendment sends, I think, the wrong message to the Iraqi people, who have suffered a great deal, and of course I recognize the loss of our soldiers and the sacrifice of our soldiers and their families.

I think this is a very ill-advised amendment and I strongly oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I am here to support the amendment to prohibit the use of ground troops in Iraq.

What the American people are seeking is an end to 10, 12, 11 years of a war without end. What the American people are seeking is attention to the needs in this country. What the veterans that have fought in that war are seeking are jobs and the proper care for the visible and invisible wounds of that war.

The only thing we need to protect—and it is not about us going into a conflict and picking sides in what is fundamentally a religious war where there will be no end for us. We must avoid and prevent combat troops being in Iraq. We do that because the American people are against it; we do that because it is the moral imperative; and we do that because we have learned a lesson from history. And history has taught us that this is a war that will not end. We have an opportunity to end it. We have an opportunity to demand of the international community that they use diplomacy to solve the problem in the region.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute now to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, it is as simple as this: the al-Maliki government has abused and excluded huge portions of his population. Because of that, there is a conflict in that country of al-Maliki's own making. Now, what we are going to do if we send combat troops there is literally be his air force, be his ground troops. We shouldn't do that. That is not the right thing for the United States to do.

If we want to help, what we should do is engage the regional community, the countries around Iraq and Iraqi leaders, in a diplomatic solution that hopefully includes them having a more inclusive, less abusive government. That is the proper role of the United States. Trying to stop us from being combat troops is the right thing to do. I urge everybody to support this.

I think the gentleman is incorrect; we are right to stay out of this thing. What, after all, have we learned if 11 years has not taught us? Training? We have given plenty of training. We have trained these people up the wazoo. They abandoned their post. It is not a training problem.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, in closing, let me just underscore the fact that combat operations will not solve the problems in Iraq. This amendment would not fund combat operations. We should not repeat these terrible mistakes of the past.

Let me once again clarify. This amendment would not impact the ability of the United States personnel and our Embassy. We want to protect the United States personnel and Embassy.

Secondly, it would not impact the President's ability to provide unmanned intelligence gathering and assistance. It would not impact the President's constitutional authority to

protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad.

I urge for a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of her time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment that would reiterate Congress' objection to a proposed policy change by the Department of Labor Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program. That would treat health care providers as Federal contractors.

In December 2010, OFCCP quietly issued directive 293 asserting that contractual arrangements under Medicare, TRICARE, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will trigger OFCCP jurisdiction. This directive would reclassify a majority of hospitals in the United States as Federal contractors, subjecting hospitals in your district and mine to OFCCP's often crushing regulatory burden.

With respect to TRICARE, the agency aggressively asserted in its jurisdiction in the 2009 administrative case OFCCP v. Florida Hospital of Orlando, OFCCP argued the hospital was a Federal subcontractor by virtue of its participation as a provider in a TRICARE network of providers.

The agency took this troubling position despite the fact that the Department of Defense, which regulates TRICARE, previously included: "It would be impossible to achieve the TRICARE mission of providing affordable health care for our Nation's Active Duty and retired military members and their families if onerous Federal contracting rules were applied to the more than 500,000 TRICARE providers in the United States."

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, the administrative law judge in the case did not heed DOD's warning and failed to

see this policy change for what it is: an expansion of government power over the health care sector. As such, Congress acted to oppose this overreach, and the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act clarified that a TRICARE network health care provider is not a Federal contractor or subcontractor.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply concerned by this attempt by OFCCP to expand its jurisdiction through executive fiat. In response, I introduced the Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act, which would clarify that health care providers are not Federal contractors subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Our actions on the committee in bringing attention to this issue have been successful in prompting OFCCP to place a moratorium on the policy. However, as OFCCP has previously defied Congress and the Department of Defense, I believe this amendment is necessary. Therefore, Madam Chair, I ask the House to support my amendment that would prohibit funds to be used under this act for implementing this overreach and affirmatively show the House will not support such actions by the Department of Labor and OFCCP.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the recognition.

I appreciate the thrust of the gentleman's amendment. I rise in opposition to it, however, because I think it is overly broad.

One of the concerns I have is, if it is adopted, I am concerned about whether or not technical assistance could continue to be given to contractors and subcontractors; and, obviously, given the complexity of the law, it would be helpful for them to have it, and I would not want it to be prohibited.

Additionally, the amendment would appear to interfere with the OFCCP's ability to connect outreach and, again, technical assistance under the current moratorium to help contractors and subcontractors understand their obligations under the law.

So again, I appreciate where the gentleman is coming from. I am concerned that, given the broadness of the amendment, it may inhibit the type of information and assistance that these contractors and subcontractors really do need. So, for that reason, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern; however, as DOD has recommended in the past and stood on the fact that, for purposes of TRICARE and the like, hospitals are not contractors, they do not contract with the Federal Government, with the Department of Defense.

□ 1830

So I don't see the reason for continuing to address this issue any further for these contractors, at least as defined by OFCCP.

In closing, again, this is an issue that DOD has spoken on strongly, this is an issue that Congress has spoken on, this is an issue that OFCCP continues to push. I believe we would be remiss if we allowed this to happen and allowed the concept that hospitals would be considered government contractors simply for providing health care under TRICARE and the like to our veterans, to our military, and certainly to any of our Federal employees.

I would appreciate support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal contracts issued by the Department of Defense from going to entities incorporated in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, two nations most often abused as tax havens.

This body accepted a similar provision for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development earlier this month.

According to a joint study by the U.S. Public Interest Research Group and Citizens for Tax Justice, 70 percent of the companies in the Fortune 500 used tax havens last year. These com-

panies stashed nearly \$2 trillion offshore for tax purposes, with almost two-thirds of that total, 62 percent, being hidden away by just 30 companies.

We just saw the medical device manufacturer Medtronic, a company founded in a Minnesota garage with deep roots throughout the State, announce it was effectively moving operations to Ireland to escape its tax obligations. This is a persistent and a growing problem, and we need to start taking action to rein it in.

We can start with this amendment. Of the companies who have established subsidies in tax havens, nearly two-thirds have registered at least one in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands. The profits these companies claim were earned in these two island nations in 2010 totaled over 1,600 percent of these countries' entire yearly economic output.

These companies take advantage of our education system, our research and development incentives, our skilled workforce, and our infrastructure, all supported by U.S. taxpayers. They should not be allowed to pretend that they are an American company when it is time to get a defense contract, then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill comes. We should not spend taxpayer money on Federal contracts to companies that have renounced their American citizenship in favor of an island tax haven.

As I said, a similar amendment became part of the Transportation and Infrastructure bill. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, we do not oppose the amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, that is very good to hear.

I join in supporting this amendment as a coauthor of it. Multinational corporations that do business around the globe have an even greater interest in world order and in national security. They should not be paying a lesser rate of taxes than corporations that focus their business right here in America.

Unfortunately, some of them scheme to avoid their fair share and to shift the burden to smaller businesses and to individuals. Some of these same companies have on more than one occasion paid more to their lobbyists to lobby this Congress and the Treasury to avoid paying taxes than they actually pay to the Treasury. It has been a pretty wise investment for them because our Tax Code is a mess. It is riddled with preferences and loopholes and one exception after another.

This amendment addresses one of the most egregious tax gimmicks. That is where a corporation actually renounces its American citizenship, declares itself a citizen of some other country, and then continues operations in

America, demanding the full protection of the laws and the military and the educational system that it refuses to contribute a fair share to pay for. Tax lawyers call it an “inversion”; I call it a perversion of our tax laws.

To add insult to injury, some of these same corporations, which have abandoned their citizenship, then ask for American government contracts paid for with the very tax dollars from the small businesses and individuals to whom they have shifted the tax burden.

American companies that stay and contribute to building our country and keeping her strong at home and abroad deserve a level playing field, and that is what this amendment does.

The action that we take in approving this amendment today sends a message to executives that they can pretend that their company is located on some Caribbean beach to avoid paying taxes, but Congress is not going to put its head in the sand about this kind of tax dodging.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the Chair.

Madam Chair, I and others have long fought for—and we have succeeded in passing through the appropriations process—a ban on Federal contracts for U.S. companies that acquire a business in a lower tax jurisdiction and claim their headquarters there, despite still being a U.S. company.

According to a 2009 GAO report, 63 of the 100 largest publicly traded U.S. Federal contractors reported having subsidies and tax havens in 2007. These companies are currently paying a tax rate of zero percent—zero percent. So unless you believe tax reform should eliminate taxes for U.S. companies, this avoidance is not about corporate tax reform.

We need to send that clear message. If a company is going to abuse the tax loopholes at the expense of businesses that are paying their fair share, they will not be rewarded with defense contracts.

I am happy to hear and I urge my colleagues to make this stand with me again and to pass this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to appoint

chaplains for the military departments in contravention of Department of Defense Instruction 1304.28, dated June 11, 2004, incorporating change 3, dated March 20, 2014, regarding the appointment of chaplains for the military departments.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, the amendment before you today holds the Department of Defense to current accepted DOD policy and standards when appointing military chaplains. It maintains the status quo, which has been well accepted for decades, if not centuries. My amendment affirms the spiritual role of chaplains in the U.S. armed services, preserving the integrity of the U.S. Chaplain Corps.

I want to thank Representatives JIM BRIDENSTINE and JAMES LANKFORD for their cosponsorship of this amendment. This amendment was adopted last year during the House's consideration of DOD appropriations on a bipartisan basis, although it was ultimately dropped from the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. I would urge my colleagues to support its passage again today.

Chaplains by definition are ministers for spiritual needs to people of secular institutions. They are equipped to do so because, like many other professionals requiring a certain skill set, chaplains possess a belief in God or a spiritual world view. Chaplains are experienced in their field, educationally qualified, and are willing to serve and attend to the spiritual needs of all members of the armed services, regardless of whether or not that soldier, sailor, airman, or marine shares the same faith as that of the chaplain.

Current DOD guidelines requires that the candidates be endorsed by a “qualified religious organization” whose primary function is to perform religious ministries to a nonmilitary lay constituency and which holds tax-exempt status as a church.

Faith and spiritual leadership are integral and inseparable from the institution of the Chaplain Corps. It would be difficult for an individual lacking in any faith to be appointed as a military chaplain without first dismantling the purpose of the chaplaincy and making significant changes to the DOD policy.

Madam Chairman, it is an oxymoron to have a secular person attached to a secular institution as a chaplain. How can that person minister to the spiritual needs of others? Even so, there continues to be a movement to appoint atheist chaplains in the military. Such individuals reject the very existence of God, a deity, or even a spiritual world view, and thus an atheist chaplain would not serve any identifiable need for servicemembers that is not already currently being met with the Armed Forces.

There are a host of other nonspiritual services available to support peo-

ple in a nonfaith context, including social workers, psychologists, and counselors. Through Military OneSource and the Military and Family Life Counselor Programs, servicemembers can receive temporary and confidential counseling services from a licensed professional without any attachment to their records. In addition to these services, military chaplains can stand ready to faithfully and respectfully serve all servicemembers with any resources they might need, regardless of whether the individual shares the chaplain's faith.

My amendment would prevent DOD from making changes to its longstanding appointment process that could undermine the integrity of the chaplaincy and interfere with the chaplain's responsibility to meet the religious needs of our brave men and women in uniform.

I would like to thank the Family Research Council and the Chaplain Alliance for their support of this amendment, and urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, the gentleman has spoken much about the spiritual role of chaplains in the military. I am very concerned that the impulse here is related to sexual orientation and the limitation in serving as a chaplain in the United States military.

I would tell the gentleman at one time in my life—and I obviously took a bad turn in the road because I got involved in politics—I was in a Roman Catholic seminary. My God is a loving God. My God is a tolerant God. My God passes judgment on the goodness of a person's soul. In this day and in this world, where there is so much hate and violence and anger, I think it is very disappointing that we in public life would try to accentuate that there are differences between us that may cause us not to like each other.

Each of us seeks our God differently. We have different religions, we have different customs, we have different preferences. But it is important to find that chaplain and spiritual guide who meets those needs to help us to find that just and forgiving and kind God.

I think it is wrong to foreclose any avenue for any American, and particularly those who put the uniform of this country on and risk their lives for us and are under incredible stress. To foreclose any avenue of spiritual guidance and relief for them is wrong.

I would simply close by noting that there is a monument—Thomas Jefferson—in Washington D.C.

□ 1845

One of the writings of Jefferson is on the southeast portico. It says:

Laws and constitutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, institutions must advance to keep pace with those times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as a civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.

My vote would be a vote to have a tolerant policy in a tolerant country. I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. It is interesting. The gentleman argues that—amazingly—somehow a chaplain is not going to be open to serving the spiritual needs of all, whether they be gay or otherwise.

There is nothing in this amendment that says anything about the choice of one's sexual partner whatsoever. In fact, remember that we already have in our chaplaincy Wiccans, Buddhists, Muslims, Christians, and Jews. Many of those accept same-sex marriages.

This argument that the gentleman makes is for another debate, not for this one. This deals purely with atheism. It is very interesting because the scene is that, on the battlefield, you have a chaplain who is serving the spiritual needs of a dying soldier and the soldier asks the chaplain: What happens now? What happens after my death?

The answer from the atheist chaplain is: There is nothing for you after death.

That is really a very disturbing thought, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I stand for a tolerant Nation, and I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, this amendment would simply prohibit funding for any operations or activities pursuant to the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq.

Why is this amendment necessary? Well, more than 2 years since the United States troops withdrew from Iraq, the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force remains on the books.

Two years ago, President Obama declared the war in Iraq as over. Just yesterday, according to press reports, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney stated that the 2002 AUMF is "no longer used for any United States Government activities."

Further, in our Appropriations Committee, our chairman confirmed that this bill does not contain any funding to implement the 2002 authorization. That is good news, and it should make supporting this amendment an easy thing to do for Members on both sides of the aisle.

The American people need an affirmative vote that the war in Iraq that began over 11 years ago through the military operation—shock and awe, which took over 2,000 lives—has come to an end and none of their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent.

Some of us agree that it is well past time that we remove this authorization totally from the books, but on this appropriations bill, we only state very clearly that no funds may be obligated or expended for the authorization.

Congress should never allow war-funding authorizations to remain on the books in perpetuity. We don't do this for the farm bill. We don't do this for the transportation bill.

Madam Chair, we are all familiar with reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place there. Once again, I want to applaud President Obama for reiterating again today that there is no military solution to the sectarian war there and also for his clear position that the United States is not going to be returning to combat in Iraq.

This amendment does not limit the President's authority under the Constitution or War Powers Act to act if there is a direct or imminent threat to our national security.

As the President cited in his recent letter to Congress, doing so would be consistent with his responsibilities to protect United States citizens both home and abroad. This amendment does not take away that authority.

Further, this amendment fully allows for the protection of the United States Embassy and its personnel and would not impede any of those efforts by the United States military.

Given that there is no funding in this bill for the 2002 AUMF, supporting this amendment is just plain common sense. The American people deserve this vote. It is long overdue. We should vote primarily also to ensure that our constitutional role is reasserted in war-making.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

As the gentlelady knows, U.S. military action in Iraq came to an end in December of 2011. I want to make sure that she also knows that there are no funds in this act for military action in Iraq, pursuant to the Iraq AUMF resolution. Its grant of authority has both practically and legally ended.

This amendment is an amendment in search of a problem, a problem that doesn't exist. This amendment is not about substance. To a great extent, it is about symbolism. It is intended to send a message that the United States has washed its hands of Iraq, which we haven't.

At a time when sectarian tensions are at the highest level since we left and terrorists have, once again, succeeded in capturing large swaths of territory in Iraq and brutalizing the Iraqi people after our troops essentially fought to protect them, what kind of message are we sending with this amendment to both the Iraqi people and to the men and women of our Armed Forces and our international armed forces who so valiantly served?

Let me repeat that there are no funds in this act for the purpose the gentlelady is seeking to limit. The only thing this amendment would accomplish is to make, quite honestly, a political statement.

I recognize, from time to time, that needs to be done, but I think it sends the wrong message at the worst possible time. I don't believe that such an amendment has any purpose on our bill, and I urge strong rejection of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

The fact is the gentlewoman has mentioned this authorization is very dated. The world has changed. It needs to be reconsidered.

I deeply appreciate her efforts not just today on the floor, but in committee and over the years to essentially force the issue and to ask this institution to reconsider what the authorities should be going forward.

I certainly support her effort.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the ranking member for his comments and for reasserting and reassuring Members that our constitutional role is extremely important in matters of war and peace.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. This Congress has a constitutional obligation to approve military action before any President decides to shoot first and ask questions later. A 12-year-old resolution, enacted in the aftermath of 9/11, should not provide a basis for endless war.

Some of the same self-certified smart people who were talking about mushroom clouds and weapons of mass destruction are, once again, trying to stampede us into war. We have been there, and we have done that, and America is still paying a terrible, terrible price for their past failures, though they refuse to acknowledge them.

Protecting our Embassy in Baghdad is one thing—a true emergency—but if any President wants to launch offensive military action, they need to come and make a specific case to this Congress for authorization, just as President Obama said he would do last year on Syria, not some convoluted interpretation of a resolution from a different time and circumstance.

If there is a case for war, have the courage to come here and make it, but don't rely on an open-ended authorization of military force from long ago.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from California for this amendment, but also for her longstanding work on this issue and related issues.

When we hear about this impossible situation which we find ourselves in today in Iraq, with the country clamoring for us to do something, we should be reminded of how we got there. It is not because of something that has expired. It is because of something that still exists.

The gentlelady is absolutely right that we should repeal that, repudiate that, and get ourselves on a new track, which requires deliberate attention by the Congress, if we are ever going to use military force, and not a blank check to the administration.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, stay tuned as our Commander in Chief and our allies contemplate future action in Iraq. As things get worse, things go south, a lot of innocent people are killed.

I am respectful of the gentlewoman's passion and her continuing battle to get this matter straightened out, but the President is still going to request for Congress to look at things. I think we should stay tuned.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels, unless their life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources.

My amendment is simple. It would stop the government from enforcing the ban on agencies funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations bill from being forced to comply with section 526.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and that it can rely upon the domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

One of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable Middle Eastern crude resources.

I offered this amendment to 13 prior appropriations bills in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014; and each time, these amendments passed with bipartisan support.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill, to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, the gentleman talks about the burden. The gentleman talks about the requirement. I would talk about our requirement to ease the burden on the American people as far as our continued dependency on fossil fuel, on overseas options as far as how we secure our carbon, and as I have said a number of times during the debate during the last 2 days, we should never foreclose options for our military. There is a pur-

pose for this requirement and this policy because the Department of Defense is the largest entity on the planet Earth relative to the purchase of fuel, and it is a perfect way to begin to wean ourselves from some of these foreign sources.

Some argue that section 526 harms our military readiness. This is simply not the case. In July, the Department of Defense stated very clearly that the provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we need today, worldwide, to support military missions, but it also sets an important baseline in developing the fuels we will need in the future.

The Department, itself, supports section 526, recognizing that tomorrow's soldiers, sailors, air personnel, and marines are going to need a greater range—more options—of energy sources. In fact, the Department of Defense says that repealing this section could complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy options to our warfighters and take advantage of the promising developments in homegrown biofuels.

I do believe that the amendment would damage the developing biofuels sector at the worst possible time for our economy. We need to create jobs, not to eliminate them. It could also send a negative signal to America's advanced biofuels industry and result in adverse impacts in rural development areas and in exports of the world's leading technology. Section 526 doesn't prevent the sale of dirty fuels, nor does it prevent Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need to. Instead, it simply prevents the Federal Government from propping up the makers of different types of carbon fuels with long-term contracts. Developing and bringing advanced, low-carbon biofuels to scale is a critical step in reducing the Nation's dependency on oil.

As someone who is possessed with the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America in the First Congressional District, we are going to sell a lot of oil, but we ought to look at having a broad matrix, and the Department of Defense is a place to start, so I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, the opposition does not understand my amendment.

This amendment does not do anything with respect to restricting the ability of the Department of Defense to buy any green fuel, biofuel, experimental fuel, or any other kind of fuel.

What it does do in the situation of the refinery in the gentleman's district, if it turns out to start using Canadian oil sands crude as one of their feedstocks, is to prevent that refinery from not being able to sell its fuel to the military. The gentleman's argument is exactly backwards. This allows the military to buy the fuel from whatever source whether it is biofuels, green fuels, conventional sources, some

other coal-to-liquid source, or a Canadian oil sand source. It gives them the greatest opportunity at the cheapest cost to buy the fuel that allows our warfighters to worry about taking care of defending this country and not to worry about where the source of the fuel comes from.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to transfer man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) to any entity in Syria.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, if there is one simple lesson that we can take away from our involvement in conflicts overseas, it is this: beware of unintended consequences.

As was made vividly clear with the U.S. involvement in Afghanistan during the Soviet invasion decades ago, overzealous military assistance or the hyperweaponization of a conflict can have destabilizing consequences and, ultimately, undercut our own national interests.

It is for this reason that I offer this bipartisan amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), and others to prevent funds in this bill from being used to transfer man-portable air defense systems, known as "MANPADS," to parties in the Syrian civil war. MANPADS, also known as "shoulder-fired anti-aircraft missiles," can be fired at an aircraft by individuals on the ground, and they can be easily hidden or transported in the trunk of a car.

According to the Los Angeles Times:

U.S. and Israeli officials have feared that they could be used by terrorists to bring down commercial airliners.

Leaders of the Syrian opposition movements have told The Wall Street Journal and other news outlets that they are actively seeking the transfer of MANPADS from the U.S. and our allies and that U.S. officials continue to consider these requests. I urge the support of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept your amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would join the chairman in thanking the gentleman for his initiative. He raises a very good point, and I support his amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. In reclaiming my time, I thank both of the floor leaders for their support.

Madam Chair, I want to make clear that this amendment will simply ensure that no funds may be made available under this bill for the transfer of these devastating and highly mobile weapons to any party in the Syrian civil war. So, regardless of one's opinion about U.S. intervention in foreign conflicts, this prudent and responsible amendment deserves our support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the U.S. Global Climate Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nations' Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is identical to the one that the House adopted last month to the National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending money on climate change policies forced upon them by the Obama administration.

We shouldn't be diverting financial resources away from the primary missions of our military at a time when we face many threats. Just look at what is happening around the globe: Iraq is splintering; Syria is still engulfed in a civil war; Russia continues its threat against Ukraine and Crimea; North Korea continues its saber rattling; Iran refuses to stop its pursuit of nuclear weapons; the Taliban threatens stability in Afghanistan; Hamas has now captured teenagers and is holding one of them, an American teenager, in Israel; and ISIS, Boko Haram, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups are promoting instability and threatening liberty and freedom all around the world.

Madam Chairman, we live in a dangerous world, yet our military is being

forced to make due with less. Spending precious resources to follow the Obama climate change agenda will compromise our national security.

When this same amendment was being adopted previously, some people claimed the amendment would prevent the military from using science. That is not true. This amendment merely prevents the Pentagon from spending money—precious money—to implement policies based on the Obama administration's climate assessment and on the United Nations' reports. These are widely acknowledged as political documents, adopted by people with an agenda. We should not be spending money pursuing ideological experiments when we face military challenges around the world. This amendment will ensure we maximize our military might without diverting funds for a politically motivated agenda, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comment that we should look around the world and see what is happening.

I look in the Pacific, and I am struck because of the gentleman's concern about the Department of Defense and the commander for the United States Pacific Command's pivoting to Asia. Admiral Samuel Locklear states that the single greatest threat to long-term peace in the Pacific basin is climate change. These threats increase with the demand for energy as temperatures rise but also as natural disasters happen with greater frequency, causing increased operational demands on military forces serving in stability and support roles.

With these disturbing trends documented in the most recent assessments, it would be irresponsible, I believe, to prevent the continued assessment of this real and changing threat.

I would note that no funds shall be used for the research program. What has ever happened in this country where we can't do research? What we do today is: let's not see anything; let's not hear anything; let's not learn anything; let's not research anything. If my parents took that attitude of "let's do nothing," we would still be waiting for the interstate system to be built.

It is time we do something. This attack on research and inquisitiveness and on the seeking of knowledge, whether we agree on all of the facts or not, is very disturbing to me, and I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, with all due respect to the minority leader, in this amendment, we are not stopping research, and we are not denying that there is climate change occurring. We are merely saying that we

should not be diverting money to implement the political documents that we list in the amendment.

□ 1915

There is ample research. There is ample reason to continue the work that we are doing, but we don't need to be using these documents that are widely acknowledged as politically-driven documents.

We want to continue the research, but not using these documents, these very specific documents.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would simply say that these documents are research-oriented and technical updates, and we ought to pursue knowledge. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

Ms. HANABUSA (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, the Hanabusa-Garamendi amendment is simple. It would ensure that President Obama does not circumvent the War Powers Resolution by unilaterally committing U.S. forces to operations in Iraq.

I have opposed our involvement in Iraq since 2002 and continue to oppose it today.

On Monday, President Obama invoked the War Powers Resolution to send an additional 275 troops into Iraq to increase security at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Today, we heard possibly an additional 300 personnel.

While I understand the need to send troops into Iraq for the express purpose of providing security for U.S. personnel in Iraq, and this amendment would not prevent the additional Embassy security recently announced by the administration or any evacuation operations, I remain resolute that we should not resume combat operations in Iraq.

Congress and the administration need to seriously consider the lack of objectives or an endgame the U.S. would achieve through further military involvement in Iraq. We know the results when we don't know what the end game is and we don't fully consider the consequences of military action, and this miscalculation is not worth repeating to involve our Nation in a situation that is the result of a longstanding sectarian conflict.

After over a decade of U.S. military action in the Middle East that has taken lives and come at far too high a cost of our Nation's resources, we must let the Iraqi people decide their own future.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are estimated to have cost between \$4 trillion to \$6 trillion, taking into account the medical care of wounded veterans and expensive repairs to the force depleted. This monetary figure cannot come even close to measuring the human lives that were taken as a result of our involvement in the Middle East.

Madam Chairman, we simply cannot afford the options under consideration. U.S. forces should be on a new strategy for regional engagement, rather than considering options that we get involved as we have in the past. This amendment would do that.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment and ensure that the President abides by the law and does not put American lives at risk by involving U.S. troops in combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment. I certainly would rise in support of it and certainly think it is acceptable to the committee.

I would point out to my colleagues though that, if you would, your view has been anticipated. I would draw my colleagues' attention to section 8113 of the underlying legislation, as well as section 9013.

So I do not want anyone to think that the committee itself, including the chairman, was inattentive to the points you raise.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member of the subcommittee for accepting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide weapons in Syria.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Nebraska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I believe this amendment is absolutely consistent with the underlying portions of the bill that reaffirm that the policy of the United States should be that we will not enter into armed conflict in Syria.

Madam Chair, along the Syrian-Turkish border there is a family—a mother, a father, and six children. One of the children is named Elias.

Elias, one day, in his home town in Syria, was walking to school. He had his hand on the schoolroom door. Then all of a sudden he felt another hand come across his face and everything went dark as he was blindfolded and kidnapped by a Syrian rebel group in the name of liberating the Syrian people.

Fortunately, the family was able to get Elias back, but they had to flee to a refugee camp from their hometown in Syria. Perhaps they are the lucky ones, because 160,000 other Syrians are dead.

Let's make no mistake: the current President, the ruler of Syria, Assad, is responsible for many of these deaths. Assad is a brutal tyrant. But many innocent Syrians, like Elias and his family, fear the rebel armies even more than Assad.

The rebel movement is a battleground of shifting alliances and bloody conflicts between groups that now include multinational terrorist organizations. Some of the most violent and the successful rebel militias are linked to al Qaeda.

Now, sending our weapons into this chaotic war zone could inadvertently help these extremists, jihadists who would be all too eager to seize American weaponry. And it has already happened.

The horror show now unfolding in Iraq suggests that we have already, unintentionally, aided sociopathic zealots. The murderous leaders of the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria have seized American Humvees and weaponry from the disintegrating Iraqi army.

Madam Chair, a CIA analyst on acid could not have imagined this nightmare scenario a week ago. Our best foreign policy analyst could not have seen the ferocity and speed of the collapse of large portions of Iraq.

What we are witnessing is the development of a multinational quasi-emirate, ruled with a ruthless interpretation of Shari'a law. The ISIS marches under the black flag of death.

Madam Chair, the naive notion that we can deliver weapons to vetted, moderate opposition groups at war with other rebel militias gives no guarantee that our weaponry won't be seized or diverted, making an already terrible civil war even worse.

The ad-hoc arming of Syrian rebels, absent a broader multinational strategy in the region, is a recipe for disaster, for further disaster.

Look, I understand this is a complicated situation. It is a hard situation, and there are no good options here. But we cannot afford to do something that may make the situation worse.

In my judgment, the potential benefits from this policy do not outweigh this very significant risk. Just talk to the people in the refugee camps. Talk to Muslim families, Christian families who have had to flee their home. Talk to them. I think we should all remember Elias and what his family has had to go through.

Madam Chair, at this time I yield as much time as he would like to consume to the Congressman from New York, Representative CHRIS GIBSON, Army Iraq war veteran, Purple Heart, professor at West Point.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank my friend and colleague.

Madam Chair, if another country gave arms to a rebel group or another country for the express purpose of attacking our country, we would view that act as an act of war. But for some reason, we don't hold ourselves to that same standard.

If it is the intent of the administration to give arms to any group then, under our Constitution, the administration must first come here and debate it on the floor and get authorization from the people's representatives.

So, Madam Chair, I oppose us getting involved in the Syrian civil war. I believe that there is more that we can do diplomatically to isolate the Assad regime, but I don't think giving arms to any rebel group is in our best interest.

But most certainly, if that is ever to occur, there first has to be an authorization. So I urge my colleague to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the heartfelt arguments and the concern of the gentleman who serves on the committee. We had a discussion of this amendment in committee, and it did fail on a voice vote.

I would agree with the gentleman when he said that the situation in Syria and that part of the world is very complicated, and that there are no

good options. I can't argue that point either.

He also stated that there are significant risks if weapons are, if you would, provided, and I could not deny that.

But at some point in time, given the problems we have in that area of the world and the people who have been displaced and who are in those refugee camps, I think we ought to keep what few unpleasant options we have open, to assume a reasonable risk if, at some future point in time during the next year to year and a half, we can work to improve the situation.

So with all due respect and understanding of the gentleman's concerns, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, let me say I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But we appreciate the passion in which they make their case and certainly, Mr. FORTENBERRY, in the committee, did a very fine job recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. involvement in Syria.

Our bill, as you are aware, contains a provision, section 9013, which prohibits the introduction of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria, except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

The situation in Syria is as dire as you have described it. We have about 4 million refugees outside the country, doing incredible things, destabilizing one of our best allies, Jordan, in a huge way.

The ranking member and I had an opportunity to visit one of those refugee camps. We need to be mindful of the actions we take here and, perhaps, what we might be doing to limit the President's assistance and our U.S. support for one of our greatest allies, two of our greatest allies in the Middle East, both Israel and Jordan.

So I think we ought to move with caution. We understand your underlying sentiment. In some ways we agree with it.

We don't think we ought to tie the administration's and the Commander in Chief's hands in the way that you have suggested.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield what remaining time I have to the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for this respectful dialogue.

These are tough judgment calls. I understand that. In my judgment, the risks do not outweigh the potential rewards here.

Until we have a strong, significant multinational strategy to contain this contagion, I believe an ad hoc policy—which it appears to me we now have—by sending weapons into this area, po-

tentially could make this situation worse.

As the gentleman from New York, Congressman GIBSON, pointed out, it is the responsibility of Congress to potentially revisit this issue if we need to reassess the situation, and it becomes much clearer and necessitates U.S. action; but now, to me and my conscience, it is important to say no.

Last year, we had a very strong bipartisan vote that demanded that the United States would not enter into a military conflict in Syria. The American people spoke loudly and clearly, and I think this is simply an extension of that understanding.

I understand the differences of opinion here in judgment, and I very much appreciate the time and respect accordingly.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Fortenberry amendment to H.R. 4870, although I understand my friend's intentions. Our country is wary of intervention half-way across the world.

I understand the impetus to avoid engagement in these very urgent challenges around the world.

Syria's horrendous civil war has seen over 140,000 deaths, 4 million refugees, the use of chemical weapons, mass starvation, the obliteration of entire cities, and growing instability throughout the region.

Syria's odious dictator, Bashar Assad, remains in power and continues to slaughter and starve his people. Innocent civilians have been denied food and medicine, their towns and villages have been razed, and their friends and families driven into refugee camps.

The war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the Assad regime are a horrific stain on the 21st century, and they demand a much more serious international response.

To many, the carnage in Syria has seemed like a distant problem.

But we can no longer take comfort that our nation is thousands of miles from the Levant. This conflict, which has often seemed like it couldn't get any worse, is evolving in an even more ominous direction.

Of course, we're seeing how the extremist terrorist group, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has used Syria and Iraq as its breeding ground. Our headlines show the group is carrying out a bloody offensive in places all too familiar to U.S. marines.

I am most concerned that in recent months, ISIL and its likeminded extremist groups have begun to turn their attention to the west. It appears that they are using the Levant and Iraq.

But choosing between ISIL on one hand and Assad on the other is a false choice. Assad has . . . let these extremist groups fester in Syria. His plan is to show how reasonable he looks compared to an emerging terrorist threat.

This false choice leaves out the moderate Syrian opposition that doesn't subscribe to Assad's brutality or Al-Qaeda's extremism.

With the emergence of this dual threat in Syria, it is clear that we need a new strategy to end Assad's carnage and prevent Al Qaeda and like-minded groups from establishing safe havens in Syria that could be used to plot attacks against the U.S. and our allies.

Yet, the Fortenberry amendment constrains that strategy. I believe we must aggressively ramp up our efforts to support the moderate opposition in Syria.

It is not too late.

It is not too late to help the moderate opposition. It is not too late to transition to a Syria without Assad. It is not too late to protect ourselves and our regional allies from the threat that ISIL poses. It is not too late to help Syrians build the future they deserve.

Ultimately, I don't believe that the future of Syria will be resolved on the battlefield.

But until the day comes when Syrians representing all segments of society are ready to negotiate peace, we must be prepared to do what's necessary to counter the dangers and tragedy in Syria.

The lives of millions of innocent people and, indeed, our own national security compel us to act—and act quickly.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Fortenberry amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer aircraft (including unmanned aerial vehicles), armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents (including chemical agents, biological agents, and associated equipment), launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, or nuclear weapons (as identified for demilitarization purposes outlined in Department of Defense Manual 4160.28) through the Department of Defense Excess Personal Property Program established pursuant to section 1033 of Public Law 104-201, the 'National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1997'.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, you may recall, yesterday, I gave an impassioned plea in favor of a different version of this amendment, which was ruled out of order. I am hoping for a better result tonight; but in any event, there is only so much passion in the world, so I will keep my remarks short.

I rise today to address a growing problem throughout our country, which is the militarization of local law enforcement agencies. The New York

Times recently reported that police departments have received thousands of pieces of camouflage and night-vision equipment and hundreds of silencers, armored cars, and aircraft directly from the Department of Defense. These are military weapons.

I think this is appalling. That is why my amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from gifting excess equipment, such as aircraft—including drones—armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, and bombs to local police departments. Those weapons have no place in our streets, regardless of who may be deploying them.

As The New York Times article "War Gear Flows to Police Departments" explains:

Police SWAT teams are now deployed tens of thousands of times each year, increasingly for routine jobs. Masked, heavily armed police officers in Louisiana raided a nightclub in 2006 as part of a liquor inspection. In Florida in 2010, officers in SWAT gear and with guns drawn carried out raids on barbershops that mostly led only to charges of "barbering without a license."

One South Carolina sheriff's department now takes a new tank that it received from the Department of Defense with a mounted .50-caliber gun to schools and community events. The department's spokesman calls that tank a "conversation starter."

I don't think this is the way I want my America to be. I think we should help our police act like public servants, not like warriors at war.

I think we should facilitate a view of America where the streets are safe and they don't resemble a war zone, no matter who is deploying that equipment. We don't want America to look like an occupied territory.

I hope for the support of my colleagues, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Department of Defense Excess Property Program provides surplus military equipment to State and local civilian law enforcement agencies for use in counternarcotics, counterterrorism operations, and to enhance officer safety.

It has provided aircraft, including helicopters and small planes; four-wheel drive vehicles, such as pickup trucks and ambulances that can be used for mobile command vehicles with search warrant; entry teams; it has provided vests and helmets to protect officers, as well as other equipment.

Coming from a State and a region which suffered many deaths on September 11, 2001, we welcome this equipment. It is not misused, and the law enforcement agencies in the Northeast and throughout the country that benefit from this equipment have used it to make sure that all of our citizens are protected.

I now would be happy yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), who is a former sheriff, for some comments.

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, as a past sheriff, we utilized that equipment in a responsible way. All of the helicopters we had in our fleet were all surplus helicopters that flew as far back as Vietnam. Some of the weapons that we had came from the military. We didn't receive any bombs.

At the end of the day, you can always find misuses of any equipment that is given or utilized by law enforcement. It is the responsibility of those communities to keep that law enforcement agency in check.

To just outright ban the usage of that equipment would devastate local law enforcement agencies across the Nation, not just in Florida, but everywhere.

With that, I do appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his comments and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, what I am saying is not so much a question of whether the equipment is being occasionally misused. The question really has become whether it is ever properly used.

Can any of the gentlemen here tonight or anyone else identify a single act of terrorism that was thwarted by handing police officers helicopters that are militarized, bombs, and all sorts of gear that you would only expect to see on the battlefield?

In fact, I would venture to say that the only examples we can come up with for the actual use of these objects is the misuse of these objects, the examples that I gave that were pointed out in national media.

These weapons are not being used to defeat terrorism on our streets. Where is the terrorism on our streets? Instead, these weapons are being used to arrest barbers and to terrorize the general population. In fact, one may venture to say that the weapons are often used by a majority to terrorize a minority.

Certainly, we know of many cases—both recent and in the deep, dark past—where police have used their weapons improperly for the sake of brutality. Now, it used to be that they could only use billy clubs or guns.

Now, they can use helicopters and bombs. Before long, I suppose, given the logic propounded by my colleagues, they will be able to deploy nuclear weapons. That is not an America that I want to live in.

I respectfully submit that this amendment deserves support. We are not cutting off the use of any equipment that is already in the field. On the contrary, that is gone. That is out the door.

Bear in mind that, under the current program, these weapons are given without any strings attached. These are weapons of mass destruction, and they are deployed within our borders by our military to our law enforcement. That is not something I can abide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I have heard a lot of things in my life as a sheriff and in my 38 years in law enforcement, but I will tell you this: first of all, the Federal Government does not give local law enforcement or any law enforcement agency bombs.

The helicopters that local law enforcement receive are all demilitarized. They are all stripped out of any capability of having weapons in them. Those are used to save people's lives. They are used to find guys that have murdered people or to find rapists.

This is absolutely ludicrous to think that the equipment that is utilized by law enforcement is utilized for any reason except for public safety interests, and it happens across this Nation every day in a responsible way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Chair, these are not weapons of mass destruction. What a ridiculous characterization, respectfully. These vehicles, these aircraft are used to protect American citizens, and the law enforcement community uses them wisely, and they are overseen by responsible elected officials.

I have registered my strong opposition to this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I think my colleagues must be attacking some other amendment, not this amendment. This is not an amendment that restricts the distribution of guns or ammunition; rather, this is an amendment that restricts the distribution of armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents, chemical agents, biological agents, launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, and nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, those are all legally permitted to be distributed to our local law enforcement under current law. That is what I am trying to prevent here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for or carry out a furlough of a dual status military technician (as defined in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, the amendment treats the National Guard dual status military technicians as uniformed personnel in the event of furlough.

Dual status technicians are uniformed full-time guardsmen, but a lot of their workweek falls into a legal gray area between active duty and civilian. Essentially, they wear two hats.

They are trained to perform a particular job in the Armed Forces, and they drill in that role like all other guardsmen. However, these dual service technicians are the ones that actually keep the equipment operational.

My son serves in the Florida Army National Guard as a Black Hawk pilot. These dual service technicians are there all week long, to make sure that the helicopters he flies are viable, are safe, and can do a mission.

When they were furloughed last time under this President, we lost the ability to respond to natural disasters within the State of Florida. When we were in the hurricane season and the helicopters were not flyable because our dual service technicians had been furloughed and not treated like other full-time military personnel, we lost the capability to respond to issues that are State issues.

More than that, this same unit that I am talking about—and it goes across this Nation with regard to National Guard units and dual service technicians—they have deployed to Afghanistan, to Iraq; and when they deploy, they actually go with them because they are in uniform. They are military.

Because of the gray area they fall in, they can be furloughed by the President, like they did this last time, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and I had come to this floor to talk about that issue, and we had this same amendment, which passed unanimously, I believe, because it protects not only the States, but it also protects our national mission of self-defense here in the homeland and being able to project the force that we need.

□ 1945

So at the end of the day, these technicians who during the day wear a uniform of the United States—this time it would be the Army—in keeping the equipment serviceable and operational—and in this instance were

Black Hawk helicopters—they were furloughed. And guess what? They can only be there when they were on the drill weekend. Well, unfortunately, 3 days out of a month is not enough to keep a Black Hawk operational.

So this is really important. We are lucky this time that sequestration is put off in 2015. But that doesn't stop the Commander in Chief from changing that and furloughing these employees, another reason to save money.

At the end of the day, it is about readiness. We should do nothing that hurts readiness in our military, whether it is National Guard or Reservists, but particularly, and I will tell you from my standpoint in the State of Florida that is hurricane prone, those Black Hawks deliver rescue capability that no other vehicle provides for. And we need to make sure those dual-service technicians are treated with respect and kept on the payroll to do the job of keeping our military active with that Reserve component, the National Guard, keep them ready to respond to emergencies here at home and abroad.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Thank you for bringing this important issue to our attention. It is important that we get this right, and you put a very personal face on something which needs correction to make sure we don't go through this again. I appreciate your taking up this challenge and doing it so well.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it. And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate the work that you have done on this.

With that, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I seek the time because I agree with the assertion of the gentleman, and that is the service that is provided by the military technicians that he is looking to exempt, I agree with every word he said. I want to make it clear to my colleagues that these civilian employees, as a condition of their employment, are a member of the unit in which they work.

My problem is there are other people who are employed by the Federal Government who also do very important work, and I would include everyone who is in the Federal service. I have always taken umbrage, regardless of who was in charge of an administration, at making distinctions between essential or nonessential employees. If you do not have an essential job, I do not know why you are working for anyone.

I find it abhorrent that we lock Federal employees out. I find it abhorrent that we malign Federal employees who

are working very hard. And, again, I agree with the gentleman as far as the value of these military technicians. I made the point when this government was shut down last October and I opposed it that people wanted to ameliorate the discomfort because the Federal Government does nothing for me, and I am also sick of hearing that. My suggestion was, not wanting to shut the government down, well, then, no Federal employee should go to work.

And I happen to use O'Hare International Airport a long time. Maybe people should sit there because FAA employees do very important work to keep us safe when we are at 38,000 feet. I think of all the civilian employees who are doing very important medical work at our hospitals treating those who are wounded and damaged in body and mind because of their service. I think of Federal firefighters who have lost their lives, who have been injured fighting fires. I think of FBI civilian employees who risk their lives every day. I think of those in the Border Patrol who risk their lives every day. I think of civilian employees at the Coast Guard, and obviously I could go on.

So the one concern I have with the gentleman's amendment is we should not be discerning and choosing. We should either be all inclusive or exclusive. And the fact is we would be better spent doing our work, getting our budgets done, and never furloughing any Federal employee again, all of whom are essential.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. I certainly do appreciate the ranking member's comments about other Federal employees, and I am the last one to malign Federal employees, but this is specifically in regard to—do you remember back when we passed the Pay Our Military Act? It was that act that allowed for the President and the Department of Defense to make that determination that these folks were essential. They decided that they weren't. And, in fact, we know they are because they are the ones, like I said, that keep the equipment operational, that allows our pilots and, in particular, Black Hawk pilots the ability to fly to respond to missions at home and abroad.

So while I don't disagree with a lot of what the ranking member said, this is really about those that wear the uniform of this country and allowing them to make sure that they are paid, A, and make sure that they are on duty to keep that equipment operational.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 12473 of April 13, 1984, as amended by Executive Order 13669 of June 13, 2014, as those amendments apply to section 405(i) of the Rules for Courts-Martial.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, last Friday, the President signed Executive Order 13669, which amended the Manual for Courts-Martial. This order delivers a significant blow to an already broken military justice system that will further revictimize servicemembers brave enough to come forward and report that they have been sexually assaulted.

Specifically contained in this executive order is a provision that makes Military Rules of Evidence 412 admissible in article 32 preliminary proceedings. This particular rule of evidence outlines when previous sexual history is admissible in court-martial proceedings and is currently applied to make all sorts of demeaning and irrelevant innuendos about a victim's previous sexual history admissible in courts-martial. Now, mind you, rape shield laws have been passed by virtually every State in the Union, and the question I have is why should servicemembers be considered second-class citizens in this country?

Shockingly, this order doubles down on this harmful rule and allows the sexual history to be admissible in preliminary hearings. What is even worse, under the order, the convening authority will be able to read and consider evidence deemed inadmissible by the article 32 hearing. The military has clearly learned nothing from the Wilkerson case in Aviano, Italy.

You maybe remember that General Franklin, the convening authority, justified overturning a court-martial jury that convicted Wilkerson of having sexually assaulted a woman, and even though he was convicted by five colonels, peers of his, the general was able to look at inadmissible evidence that the judge had ruled out of order and consider that in overturning the decision.

This amendment will prohibit funds to implement the component of Executive Order 13669 to prevent this harmful and wrongheaded provision to go into effect. This order usurps and reverses the progress that, in fact, this Congress has been making in reforming article 32 proceedings, and I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate her yielding.

I appreciate her devotion to the issue and to the victims of these crimes and rise in strong support of her position,

and I appreciate not only her work but for offering the amendment today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I served on the Naval Academy Board for 5 years, and I know there is some issues in some people's mind as to whether this executive order either strengthens or weakens the case for rape shield, but I was appalled by what happened there. So I am supportive of what you are doing. There may be some arguments people may have as to whether you are strengthening or weakening it, but your desire is to strengthen and make this unacceptable behavior go away.

Ms. SPEIER. That is correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am supportive of that and congratulate you on your efforts.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I was on that Academy Board of Visitors for a number of years. The inability of the leadership of that academy, and to think that this midshipman had to go through this 30 hours is outrageous, so I commend you for what you have put forward here.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Well, Madam Chair, with that, I thank my colleagues for recognizing the importance of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay for storage for patrol boats procured under the Department of Navy Memorandum #105-E2P-196 dated October 12, 2010.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a commonsense, cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

Specifically, my amendment prohibits the Federal Government from wasting more money on storage for eight patrol boats which have cost taxpayers \$3 million, have never been used, and have been sitting in storage for almost 4 years.

Recent media reports and an inspector general's report brought this issue to my attention, and the wasteful spending involved is deplorable.

In 2010, the Federal Government spent more than \$3 million on patrol

boats for the Afghan National Police that were never shipped to landlocked Afghanistan. Even more troubling, the cost of each patrol boat was more than \$265,000. The Washington Post has reported that similar patrol boats can be purchased in the United States for approximately \$50,000 each.

The Office of the Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, also known as SIGAR, was so concerned about this waste of taxpayer money that it conducted an investigation and recently released a report. The report includes a letter dated April 24, 2014, from the inspector general to the commanding general of the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan.

I would like to share a few excerpts from letter:

I am writing to request information on a \$3 million procurement of patrol boats for the Afghan National Police initiated by the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan in 2010.

My focus is on the operational requirements that initiated the procurement of the patrol boats for the Afghan National Police and the reasons for the cancellation 9 months later.

Additionally, I am also interested in the requirement for the United States Government to pay for the storage and related expenses for these boats for the last 3 years, boats that apparently have no planned use.

According to official at the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the patrol boats were manufactured and delivered to the Navy in 2011 and have been in storage at the Naval Weapons Station/Cheatham Annex, Yorktown, Virginia, ever since.

The full report goes on to detail some other troubling findings, which include missing storage records, missing expenditure authorizations and justifications, and missing documents which should detail the reason for canceling the procurement order.

□ 2000

The inspector general's June 6, 2014, letter is even more harsh as it stated:

I continue to have concerns because the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan was unable to answer a significant number of my questions regarding the patrol boats. The list of unanswered questions is particularly troubling.

Further, the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan's response indicates that its Security Assistance office led a review board that determined that the boats do not fill a valid requirement for Afghanistan.

To help the inspector general better understand how these decisions were made and to help us prepare lessons learned reports intended to avert the waste of U.S. taxpayer funds in the future, please provide a detailed accounting of all the elements of the Security Assistance office review boat's proceedings which led to that decision, including transcripts, testimony, and exhibits.

By letter today, I have also requested the Department of the Navy to provide their plans for disposition of the boats.

I wholeheartedly agree with the inspector general, and not another penny of Federal taxpayer money should be spent on these boats that cost \$3 million to produce, were never utilized,

and have been sitting in storage since 2011.

These boats either need to be put in the water or resold, per Federal law. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of my commonsense amendment that will ensure better use of taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 34 at the desk, preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment is straightforward. It is cosponsored by Congressman BROUN of Georgia and Congressman SANFORD of South Carolina.

It will prohibit any funding in this bill pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force after December 31, 2014.

This date is set as the official end of combat operations in Afghanistan. Furthermore, it gives the President and Congress sufficient time to determine what, if any, authorization would be needed to replace the 2001 AUMF.

The fact of the matter is the world has changed dramatically in the aftermath of the horrific tragedy of September 11.

On September 14, 2001, I could not vote for the resolution, an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check to wage war any time, anywhere, for any purpose, and for any length. Thirteen years later, this authorization is still on the books.

According to the Congressional Research Service, there are over 30 known instances of the executive branch invoking authority to engage in hostilities or deploy Armed Forces under this AUMF.

The report, which is on my Web site, lists 30 instances where the AUMF has been invoked by President Bush and President Obama, including to deploy troops in Ethiopia, Djibouti, Georgia, Yemen, justify detentions at Guantanamo Bay, and conduct military commissions, among many other uses, for which this resolution served as the legal justification for.

No executive office, not President Bush, not President Obama, nor any future President can be handed such broad authority to wage war with no oversight.

In fact, President Obama has stated that he looks forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine and ultimately repeal the AUMF's mandate, and he will not sign laws designed to expand this mandate further.

We need to take up the President's suggestion. There was very little debate on this resolution. I was here 12 years ago, and so year after year, I have introduced legislation to repeal this resolution.

It is long past time for Congress to have a meaningful debate. I remember that night. There were five or six maybe on the floor, maybe a few more, and we had probably an hour's debate that evening.

We need to have a real debate about our constitutional role in declaring war and our obligation to conduct rigorous oversight, accountability, and to demand transparency and accountability for the American people for their tax dollars. I ask Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I oppose this amendment. This amendment, while disguised as a funding limitation, is really an attempt to put in place a major policy change that does not belong on our bill. It would essentially repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Let me be clear about what this amendment does. This amendment cripples our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations against terrorists who pose a threat to U.S. persons and interests.

In my judgment, this amendment dangerously and erroneously assumes that the terrorist threat from al Qaeda and its affiliates ends once military operations end in Afghanistan.

The terrorist threat today is no less real and, in many ways, is more daunting than it was when Congress overwhelmingly gave to President Bush and to President Obama the authority to protect us against those who want to do us harm.

While some would argue that core al Qaeda has weakened, as events in Yemen and most recently Iraq and Syria have not shown, we know that al Qaeda and other terrorist groups are on the rise. This amendment would end our ability to conduct any operations against them at the end of this year—inconceivable.

Core al Qaeda isn't the only threat. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, operating out of Yemen, is now considered to pose the greatest threat to U.S. citizens.

This amendment would effectively eliminate the President's ability to address the threat or other emerging threats of AQ-affiliated and like-minded groups in north Africa, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere.

If adopted, this would send terrorists the message that they just need to wait out the military authority to conduct counterterrorism operations, and then they are free to launch their attacks.

The President himself, with all due respect, has reaffirmed the need for this continued authority and uses it, I can assure you, each and every day. It would be a mistake to tie the hands of our Commander in Chief and our military by removing this authority that protects U.S. citizens and our country from terrorist threats.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady from California.

No, repealing the AUMF will not leave America vulnerable to terrorists. What it will do is put this U.S. Congress in a position to debate the legitimate—or not so legitimate, in some cases—justification for further military action.

It will update the debate. It will put us in a position to really drill down and find out whether there is a national security interest, which would justify military force in the situation moving forward.

Members of Congress, this thing is over a decade old, and it has gone far afield from its original purpose.

This AUMF has been used more than 30 times to take our country into conflict, countries literally hundreds and maybe thousands of miles away from where it was originally intended.

It is time for a new debate. It is time for a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, if we should have one. It is nothing more than a scare tactic to say that this will leave our country vulnerable.

The President is the Commander in Chief and has authority to protect the interests of the United States, but this AUMF has brought us in a direction that was not contemplated.

As the representatives of the people of the United States—that is us—we should have a say on the future of where military conflicts might be conducted. That means we repeal this AUMF, and if there is a legitimate national security interest moving forward, we should debate it on the floor and, if necessary, pass it. It is time to repeal the AUMF.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say I don't know how much time—how much more time the opposition to this amendment wants to see this authorization on the books and continue to fund it. There is no reason that a 13-year authorization should continue to be funded.

I just want to read you this, as I close, what this authorization said 13 years ago, which totally has abdicated our constitutional responsibility and authority as Members of Congress. We are abdicating our constitutional authority by not going back to the drawing board and debating any further efforts as it relates to military force.

The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he deems planned, authorized, and aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11.

That is 2001. Again, the Congressional Research Service has cited 30 instances. We know there are more. Once again, we need to come back and have a debate. We need to talk about how far removed now we are from 2001.

If we think this needs to be brought up to date, bring it up to date, but we definitely need to stop the funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to support my amendment and to support the underlying bill by my friend from New Jersey. I regret I have to bring this amendment today. It deals with a very arcane issue, the Treaty on Open Skies.

In the FY15 NDAA, H.R. 4435, we included a bipartisan provision to require certification of the national security implications for Russian Federation proposals to implement new sensors on their Open Skies aircraft.

These aircraft are allowed to fly over the United States to conduct surveillance flights. They are not supposed to supplement Russian intelligence col-

lection on the U.S., yet not long after this body passed the NDAA on a 325-98 vote, the administration opted to ignore this body's concerns, ignore the concerns of a bipartisan group of Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and approve a Russian request to improve its sensor platform.

The administration did this without regard to Russia's invasion of Ukraine and illegal seizure of Crimea. The administration did this without regard to Russia's violation of the INF treaty. The administration did this without regard to Russia's compliance failings in the New START Treaty.

The administration did this without regard to the fact that Russia is cheating on the Open Skies Treaty itself—just look at the State Department Web site. The administration did this without regard to the concerns of the Department of Defense and other government agencies.

How did Russia respond to this decision by the administration to accede to Putin's wishes? The New York Times this past weekend answered that question this way:

Rebels also claim to have shot down a Ukrainian AN-30 surveillance plane on June 6, 2014. The June 6 episode was of particular concern because it involved the destruction of one of the two planes that Ukraine used to monitor the Open Skies Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, when will we learn that we can't respond to Russian aggression with concession?

Putin responded, as he always does, by taking our concession and having his shock troops in Ukraine shoot down an airplane.

We cannot continue like this. We cannot continue to ignore Russia cheating when it comes to our treaties. We cannot continue to allow Russia to misuse arms control treaties like the Open Skies Treaty. We cannot continue to allow Russia to foment violence on NATO's borders.

□ 2015

We cannot continue to ignore the concerns of our military and other national security agencies just to make Russia feel good.

I urge support of my amendment to send a message to Russia and safeguard our national security.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain or improve Department of Defense real property

with a zero percent utilization rate according to the Department's real property inventory database, except in the case of maintenance of an historic property as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) or maintenance to prevent a negative environmental impact as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations bill that would eliminate wasteful spending on unused and underutilized facilities.

With the Federal Government being the largest holder of land in the country, management of these properties must be economically responsible. Unfortunately, our government continues to misuse taxpayer dollars maintaining vacant and underutilized properties. This mismanagement must be addressed so that taxpayer money is no longer squandered on these unused facilities.

That is why I am once again introducing this commonsense amendment, as I have with previous appropriations bills, and will continue to do so until wastefulness, both in terms of cost and efficiency, is rooted out of our government.

This proposal is an extension of the bipartisan SAVE Act I had put forward that would cut \$230 billion in government spending by rooting out waste and mismanagement such as this.

I am proud that my amendment is endorsed by a broad coalition, including the Project on Government Oversight and the National Taxpayers Union. I thank them for their support of this commonsense measure to save taxpayers money by making our government more efficient.

The Department of Defense, alone, has hundreds, possibly thousands, of buildings and structures that it has rated at zero percent utilization, yet the Federal Government continues to maintain these unused facilities at an incredible cost to taxpayers. As a CPA, this just doesn't add up. It is unacceptable that taxpayers are on the hook for maintaining these unused facilities. Putting an end to this misuse of resources could save tens of millions of dollars a year, smart savings we should all support, regardless of party affiliation.

Mr. Chair, when I came to Congress, I promised my constituents that I would scrutinize the Federal budget so that their money was not wasted, promoting smarter governing. This is a simple solution to do just that.

This amendment was passed by the House last year with bipartisan support, and I ask my colleagues to again support this measure that can save American taxpayers tens of millions of dollars in this year alone. Let's come together and show the American people that we can work together to promote better government and smarter spending.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am pleased to accept your amendment.

I yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY, if you care to make any comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I certainly appreciate the fact that the gentleman is looking to be very cost effective in avoiding the expenditure of unnecessary funds and strongly support his position. I appreciate his offering the amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, 148, at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

It has been brought to my attention from numerous sources within my district that in 2009 the Department of Army fully phased out the CWU-27/P Army aviation flight uniform and moved to the Army Aircrew Combat Uniform, also known as the A2CU.

Constituents of mine, many of whom are Active Duty, retired, or friends and family of military personnel, have expressed a strong desire for the Army to go back to the CWU-27/P model uniform.

There are multiple reasons to switch back to the CWU model uniform. The

most important reasons to switch back to the CWU model are safety and efficiency. But to sweeten the deal, when making the pitch to me, my constituents explained that moving back to the CWU model would also save the Department millions of dollars a year in procurement costs. Talk about hitting two birds with one stone.

First and foremost, let's touch on CWU model's proven track record of safety and practicality. The CWU model is still authorized for Army Special Operations aviators, all of the aviators in other service branches of the U.S. military, and most air forces and navies around the world. Yes, these points are a testament to the safety and efficiency of the CWU model.

And these safety aspects are of paramount importance to our Army aviators, because the chances of a fire in an aviation crash are very high. The CWU model flight suits have antistatic fiber woven in them to prevent sparks, which, for obvious reasons, are not desirable when operating an aircraft with thousands of pounds of highly volatile jet fuel on board.

The one-piece design of the CWU model is also extremely important as it does not, in the event of a fire, leave any opportunities for exposed skin. Being that the A2CU is a two-piece model exactly like ground troop uniforms, it cannot offer the same amount or types of protection. Moreover, the A2CU is also cut to a looser standard than the CWU-27/P, creating the potential for more items of clothing to snag on controls in the cockpit.

Speaking to the cost savings, the A2CU model costs an average of 56 percent more than the CWU model, and the A2CU has proven to wear out faster than the CWU. Further, every time the Army decides to change the camouflage pattern of the duty uniform, they have to spend millions more purchasing the new flight uniform. The CWU model, to my knowledge, is usually only one color per uniform.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment does not score as it is written; but being that the intent is to move back to the CWU model, the effects of the policy should actually net some cost savings. Conservative estimates show that the Army could save around \$5 million a year in procurement costs if it were to move back to the CWU model. Further, it should not cost anything to reintroduce the CWU model back into the supply system, as the rest of service branches still use them. In other words, there is no need to reboot the supply chain.

Further, the Army could replace the A2CU's with CWU's as they are exchanged by soldiers without the upfront cost of re-outfitting each soldier. The cost savings are tantalizing for someone like me who was sent to this town to rein in spending. More importantly, I listen to these Army aviators and flight operators. They tell me it is safer, and being that they are the ones

doing the training and fighting, I will take them at their word.

Given the safety and practicality applications, and given that the United States is not exactly running a budget surplus right now, saving a few million here and there in the name of safety and practicality is something we should all strive to achieve.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment which cuts costs and improves safety.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing I think Democrats and Republicans can actually agree on, it is that, if a penny is earned, that penny must be paid. This amendment is very straightforward. In fact, a version of it has already passed the House of Representatives. What it says is that, if there is a Federal contractor who has been found to engage in wage theft, that they may not benefit from this appropriation.

Now, there are many contractors who work for the Department of Defense who have employees that cook the meals for our troops, wash their uniforms, do all manner of many, many important tasks to keep fighting men and women in a position to serve our Nation. Some of them may even work in the commissary. They may work at various jobs. And they sometimes, the Federal contractors who serve the Federal Government, do not pay these workers.

Mr. Chairman, you may think, well, you know, maybe that happens, but how often does it happen? Is it really a big problem? I am here to tell you that it is a serious problem. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute found that, in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing 15 percent of their earned income.

A recent report by the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee of the United States Senate revealed

that 32 percent—that is 32 percent, fully a third—of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

Now, I think that Democrats and Republicans can agree that, if you are a Federal contractor and you want to do business with the United States, you should be fair to your workers. This bill doesn't go out and look and we are not asking anyone to make any judgments. We are talking about people who have been found to engage in wage theft already.

This amendment simply says that the funds made available in this act may be used to enter into contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed under section 2313(e)(1), title 41, and it goes on. But what it means is that you must be fair to your workers, and if you are not, you cannot benefit.

Last word I want to say about this is that don't we want to incentivize good contractors and discourage bad ones? One way we can do that is say, if you don't treat your workers right, we are going to find some Federal contractors who will.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 2030

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment and speaking out on behalf of the dignity of labor, whatever human labor that may be, and certainly believe that the amendment is acceptable to the committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. ELLISON. I certainly appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman

from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, if you turn on your TV tonight, you will see U.S. foreign policy in shambles almost across the globe. It shouldn't surprise us because basically this administration has given our adversaries or potential adversaries almost everything they wanted, even when it jeopardized our national defense.

Let me just walk you around the globe.

The number one concern the Russians had was for us to pull our missile defense systems out of Europe, and we did that, even though it left huge gaps for us in our missile defense.

The number one concern the Iranians wanted was to pull off their sanctions, and we agreed to that.

The number one concern the Afghan insurgents had was a time certain when we were going to get out.

The number one concern the Chinese had was that we not increase our Navy and we decrease it, and we saw the President send over a budget that would have effectively taken an aircraft carrier out of our fleet, would have beached half of our cruiser fleet, would have essentially eliminated or severely impacted the production of our Tomahawk missiles, and they have plans to bench six destroyers next year. Now they are getting ready to do something that is probably as egregious as all the rest, and that is to execute within the next couple of weeks the Ottawa Treaty, which would require us to pull our landmines up along the DMZ, which is the number one concern for the North Koreans.

When President Clinton looked at this, he rejected that treaty because he realized that those landmines were what kept the North Koreans from invading South Koreans for decades. When George W. Bush looked at it, he rejected it because he realized how militarily impractical it would be. And when this administration looked at it in 2009, this is what their State Department said:

We would not be able to meet our national defense needs nor our security commitments to our friends and allies if we signed this.

Then when a White House aide pushed back on that about 3 years later, the commander of our forces in South Korea, General Thurman, said this:

I wake up every morning with 1 million North Korean troops right across the border.

When we asked our current general, who is in charge of our South Korean forces, whether he thought we should move those landmines, he said they were critical to the defense of South Korea.

When we asked the top uniformed general in the United States, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he said it was a critical part of our defense. And when we asked him if anything had changed since 2009,

he quickly came back and said things have gotten worse, not better.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the landmines of yesterday that were just dropped somewhere and you worried a child would come along and stumble on them. These landmines are very targeted. They only come on when we activate them, and then they deactivate within a certain number of hours after that. In fact, the United States has already spent more than \$2 billion over the last 20 years taking those up.

So, Mr. Chairman, what this would do is to prohibit any funds from being made available under this act for the implementation of that Ottawa Treaty. It is time we start listening to our military experts at the Pentagon and we start taking their advice on what we need for national security.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, essentially, for two reasons.

One, I believe that the gentleman's amendment is moot because we are not a signatory to the convention. The United States Senate has not ratified the treaty so funds could not be expended for it.

Secondly, I do think it sends a very bad signal. The gentleman alludes to the sophistication of mines that are used today compared to say a generation ago. I don't think it is a secret that the United States does use such equipment.

But I would point out, and it is a different program within the bill—and I thank publicly the chairman, as well as the members of the subcommittee and the full committee, for increasing funding for Humanitarian Mine Action Program. It is not a large program, but its mission is of immense value. All too often innocent civilians are victims of explosive remnants of war, not just new sophisticated U.S. equipment. It is only right that we share our expertise with others, and I acknowledge it is a different program.

But the chairman and others have alluded to our visit to Afghanistan, and still remember a picture of two brothers—one didn't have a leg and the other was blind because of a mine. So I don't want to send negative signals internationally. I know that is not the gentleman's intent, but, unfortunately, I think it is inferred and, therefore, am opposed to his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this is not moot. We have it on

widespread information that the administration is planning to do this within the next 2 weeks. We even had various embassies tell us the same thing.

Secondly, as he mentioned, he is talking apples to oranges. These are not the same two kinds of programs. There is nothing more humanitarian than preventing war. We have 28,500 troops in South Korea facing all those troops in North Korea, and the thing that stands between them and us are those landmines. The gentleman can't tell me one thing that is going to stop them from coming over there if we pull those landmines up. That is why it is crucial we act now and make sure we don't make this crucial mistake and see another part of this globe in shambles over our foreign policy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purpose of conducting combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward bipartisan amendment is cosponsored by Representatives WALTER JONES and JIM MCGOVERN.

What this amendment does is prohibit any funding for combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014. Even though some of us would rather have all of our troops returned, the President announced in May that the United States would end the U.S. combat mission in December 2014.

This simple amendment codifies and clarifies the President's position. It would also allow Congress to determine and reauthorize any further combat operations in Afghanistan should the President deem it necessary.

By reinserting Congress' constitutional authority, this amendment would ensure that we have a debate and a vote in this body for the future of combat operations in Afghanistan.

Last month, I joined Congressmen MCGOVERN, JONES, GARAMENDI, and Armed Services Ranking Member ADAM SMITH in offering an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that would have required a congressional vote to continue deployment

of U.S. combat troops in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014.

Unfortunately, that amendment was not allowed to come to the floor.

Instead, to date, the Republican leadership of this House has failed to allow the American people any say in the future of America's longest war. It is really unconscionable that the Afghan public through the Afghan parliament has ample opportunity to weigh in on the future presence of United States combat troops in Afghanistan, while the American public has been given no such opportunity through this Congress.

For many years, we have known there is simply no military solution in Afghanistan, and our constituents are sick and tired of this endless war.

This war has cost taxpayers over \$750 billion, and promises to cost tens of billions more for every year our troops remain in Afghanistan. We have lost thousands of our young men and women. They conducted themselves in a way that everything we asked them to do they did, and so it is time now to honor them by ending this endless war.

This war, again, when you look at the human cost, the lives of I think it is 2,321 soldiers, and tens of thousands injured, it is really time to end this. It is time to look out for our veterans, our brave young men and women, bring them home, not fund any more combat operations, and ensure their job security, their health, their mental health, and their future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment is very vaguely crafted. It could have undue consequences. This very short amendment would make no funds available for "the purpose of conducting combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014."

Our bill contains funding for combat operations, not only for United States troops, but provides funding, equipment, lift, and sustainment of allies in the fight.

Further, within the overseas contingency operations funding account—when the OCO budget finally arrives, and we have been asking for it for months—there will be funding for combat operations for Afghanistan troops, and I suspect other troops, American troops, or international troops, through what we call the Afghan Security Forces Fund. I think there is a degree of inevitability that that will happen. Certainly we are going to have troops there I think for some time.

This amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, as it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands in navigating the complicated situation we face related to threats emanating from Iraq.

Let's be realistic. What this amendment would do is it would remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even if such engagement would be in the best interest of our country or allies.

I strongly oppose the amendment. It doesn't make sense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this amendment says we are not going to fund combat operations after December 31, 2014. That is what it says. That is what it will do. That is what the President has indicated.

For the life of me I don't understand why the opposition really believes that there is a military solution in Afghanistan. We have been there 13 years. History shows that the United States military is not going to continue to have a military presence and support what has taken place in Afghanistan. It is now up to the Afghan government and people to secure their own future.

Of course, we are not taking away any authority from the President. We have taken away our authority here, our constitutional duty and responsibility. We can't allow funding for combat operations beyond December 2014. The President has said that will not happen. So what in the world are we talking about by saying, yes, here is the money, we want you to continue funding these combat operations?

He said they would end in December of 2014, so we should do what we need to do here in Congress. We should end it, we should not allow any more funding. If, in fact, the President believes, and if you believe, that we want to engage in more combat action and operations—which, of course, the American public I believe are telling us in no uncertain terms they are war-weary—but if you believe that, then come back to Congress and exercise your constitutional duty and responsibility, and vote for whatever it is that the President is asking for. This doesn't make any sense—13 years. Again, we sunset in the farm bill, the transportation bill. Here we have got an authority now and funding for the last 13 years. It doesn't make any sense. We want to do what the President has said he is going to do.

□ 2045

This Congress needs to reassert itself and do our constitutional duty, engage in our constitutional authority and responsibility, and say in no uncertain terms: no funding for combat operations after December 31, 2014.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Sections 400AA or 400 FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(5) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(6) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment forbids defense dollars from being spent to fund two executive orders and several other provisions of law that require the military to squander billions of dollars on so-called green energy.

For example, according to the GAO, the Navy has spent as much as \$150 per gallon for jet fuel. In 2012, the Navy purchased 450,000 gallons of biofuel for its so-called green fleet at the cost of \$26.60 per gallon, at a time when conventional petroleum fuel cost just \$2.50.

What taxpayer in his right mind would pay \$26.60 per gallon to fill up his car when, next door, they are selling it for \$2.50? Yet that is precisely what our Armed Forces are ordered to do—except they are not just filling up their cars, they are filling up entire ships and aircraft, and this all comes out of our precious defense dollars.

The Air Force paid \$59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012—10 times more than regular jet fuel.

It is not just biofuels. The Pentagon expects to purchase 1,500 Chevy Volts at a subsidized price of \$40,000 apiece and a production price of \$90,000 apiece, paid for by other subsidies. As Senator COBURN's office points out:

Each one of these \$40,000 Chevy Volts represents the choice not to provide an entire infantry platoon with all new rifles or 50,000 rounds of ammunition that cannot be used for realistic training.

Under these green energy mandates, the Army and Navy have been required to install solar arrays at various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, the Navy spent \$21 million to install a 10-acre solar array, which will supply a

grand total of 2 percent of the base's electricity.

According to the inspector general's office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in only 447 years. Of course, solar panels only last about 25 years.

In Alaska, the Pentagon was ordered to convert three radar stations from diesel fuel to wind turbine energy. The Air Force claimed it will take 15 years to pay for itself, but auditors found that the generators produce only "sporadic, unusable power," and the inspector general charged that the Air Force claim was completely unsubstantiated.

As of 2013, the Defense Department had at least 680 such projects, including 357 solar, 29 wind, and 289 thermal energy projects.

There are several arguments that we hear for this mandate. One of them is it is going to save us money, but as you can see, these orders are running up huge costs. We don't know exactly how much because, as the GAO said:

There is currently no comprehensive inventory of which Federal agencies are implementing renewable energy-related initiatives and the types of initiatives they are implementing.

Outside estimates are as much as \$7 billion for the Department of Defense for this year, a figure that will only grow each year.

We are told it is to move our Armed Forces toward energy independence from hostile foreign sources. This is from an administration that has obstructed every effort to develop America's vast oil shale reserves that would make Saudi Arabia look like a petroleum pauper. The XL Keystone pipeline, by itself, would bring a half-million barrels of Canadian crude a day into this country.

Finally, we are told this is all a grand strategy to protect us from climate change, which the Secretary of State has called as big a threat as terrorism. Even if it were possible to wage an environmentally-sensitive war—which I doubt—I think there is a good chance that climate will continue to change, as it has that past 4 billion years, whether or not we waste our defense dollars to pay for this quixotic venture.

This explanation does reveal the real reason for this folly. This is an ideological crusade imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars, mainly to keep money flowing to politically well-connected green energy companies that can't get anybody else to buy their products.

These green activists are willing to squander the resources of our military to do so. This is a travesty that we can end here and now with this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this debate will mirror one that took place earlier today.

The fact is I would talk about flexibility. The gentleman talks about the costs involved. I think, when you develop new products, new technologies, there is going to be a cost, as far as that research and development.

I will point out that the comparisons, as far as some of the costs, perhaps do not fully factor into the issue of transportation and how some of those fuels get on those ships and in those airplanes in remote parts of the world.

The gentleman also alluded to the flexibility on foreign soil, where you don't have a gas station handy for some of the energy that those troops may need, so I would also reiterate that the commander for the Pacific Command, Admiral Samuel Locklear, did state that the greatest threat to long-term peace in the Pacific region is climate change.

I certainly do think that alternative fuels, given the fact that the Department of Defense is the largest consumer on the planet Earth, is worth abiding by, and therefore, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that forcing the military to pay \$26.60 per gallon for fuel that can be obtained for \$2.50 a gallon isn't about flexibility. It is about insanity, and it is time that we put an end to this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would, again, simply assert that the comparison of a gallon of gasoline at a local station compared to getting it to a jet aircraft for the Department of Defense perhaps is not necessarily comparing apples to apples.

I renew my objection to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to "consult", as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the "assurance" provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3(c)(1)(A)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is substantially

similar to an amendment that passed by unanimous voice vote among Democrats and Republicans on the House Science and Technology Committee a couple of weeks ago.

My amendment, the Grayson-Holt-Lofgren amendment, seeks to address a serious problem. Recently, it was revealed that the National Security Agency has been recklessly subverting American cryptographic standards—and deliberately so.

Cryptographic standards for the national security community and the commercial software industry are developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST. That is an agency within the House Science and Technology jurisdiction.

These standards are intended to protect Americans from foreign intelligence agencies, from cyber criminals, from industrial espionage, and from privacy violations by those who wish us harm. They are embedded in software products which are used and sold widely—in fact, almost universally in this country and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, recent media reports indicate that the National Security Agency successfully and deliberately weakened encryption standards promulgated by NIST to further NSA surveillance goals at the cost of the privacy of ordinary U.S. citizens—in fact, universally throughout the United States.

This is extremely dangerous. It leaves users of these standards vulnerable to anybody who is familiar with these weaknesses.

We can recall that, just a few weeks ago, millions of Americans were told that they had to change their user IDs and their passwords. That, Mr. Chairman, was because of this.

The NSA apparently is doing this as part of its domestic spying program, but as World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee put it:

It's naive to imagine that, if you deliberately introduce into a system a weakness, you will be the only one to use it.

My amendment would seek to address this issue by prohibiting the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST.

It is only common sense that we should not want taxpayers' dollars that are appropriated to one agency being used to deliberately and actively subvert the work of another agency and, at the same time, destroy the privacy and the liberty and the personal property of our own citizens.

I urge support for this amendment on both sides of the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not actually opposed to the

amendment, but I would like to talk about some of the assertions or allegations made by the gentleman, and I do that respectfully. I am not in opposition to the amendment, but I think there are some things that have been said that need to be replied to.

The National Security Agency has participated in standards setting with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. Of course, they would participate.

Wouldn't we want our Nation's best cryptographers to help strengthen and secure the Internet?

Their participation in setting standards is a no-brainer. You want the standards to be designed by the people who best understand the threat. They recommended the standards that they themselves use.

As the National Security Agency stated on September 30 of last year:

NSA is responsible for setting the security standards for systems carrying and transporting the Nation's most sensitive and classified information. We use cryptography and standards that we recommend, and we recommend the cryptographic standards we use.

We do not make recommendations that we cannot stand behind for protecting national security systems and data. The activity of NSA in setting standards has made the Internet a far safer place to communicate and to do business.

Indeed, our participation in standards development has strengthened the core encryption technology that underpins the Internet.

The idea that NSA has deliberately sabotaged security is ridiculous. These folks know the threat we face and are helping to secure the Internet we all rely on so heavily.

Again, I don't oppose the amendment, but the assertions need to be rebutted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to, in some respects, associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Obviously, we have a difference of agreement about the facts, but I think we agree that the NSA should actually be helping to establish the best possible standards for privacy in this country, regardless of whether the published reports that have been widely reported in the media are true or not.

I appreciate the gentleman's allegiance to the underlying principle that Americans deserve privacy.

□ 2100

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Florida for offering this amendment. It should go a long way toward recovering the lost reputation of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, this came about because the National Security Agency

has a dual role of developing encryption standards and breaking encryption. The reports widely circulated and, I think, generally verified show that these two dual roles caused real problems for American standards and, hence, for American technology and American companies.

It is unfortunate that NIST, which is supposed to be an impartial arbiter of national and of even global standards for technology, was effectively used to propagate defective encryption standards, and this amendment, I think, will help correct that. It is important that we keep high standards and that everyone knows it. This is an important amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it. I also appreciate the comments of the chair of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the National Institute of Standards and Technology, aka NIST, has always enjoyed a good reputation. I served on the committee as a ranking member, and we heavily invested in the work they do. They enjoy an incredible reputation, and the suggestion that somehow they have lost their luster and their reputation is totally inappropriate, but let's move on.

I support the bill with the reservations that I have made about some of the earlier assertions that have been basically within the media that have been pumped up, maligning not only NIST but the National Security Agency, which I think does an incredible job of protecting national security and all of us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I join in the gentleman's desire to move on, and I appreciate the gentleman's fair consideration of this amendment on the merits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is pretty simple. It says that we are not going to use any funds at this particular time to propose, plan, or execute any additional Base Realignment and Closure rounds, better known as BRAC, the reason being that this language was adopted in the

National Defense Authorization Act by an overwhelming vote of 325-98. The House has spoken and has said now is not the time to use these funds to begin this. I want to make sure that people understand that this is also in the Senate language.

I want to make sure people understand, too, that this is a process by which we want to make sure we are understanding how decisionmaking takes place. A force structure comes before decisions on infrastructure, and as you know, the service branches are still making the decision about what the end strength should be—how many people we should have in our military. That will determine what our infrastructure should be. We are also undergoing an overseas base and housing assessment to determine what our presence should be overseas. That is ongoing. That should be completed before we even entertain any consideration about what our base structure needs to be here at home.

The cost estimates for the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission in 2005 indicated that it would cost \$21 billion. Now we see it costs \$35 billion. The 2005 BRAC, as we see, hasn't saved money at all at this particular point, and it won't save money until 2018, so now is not the proper time to pursue a Base Realignment and Closure.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank the gentleman for his incredible service on the House Armed Services Committee.

May I say that the Defense Appropriations Committee has worked very closely with Chairman MCKEON as well as with you, and as you know, our bill contains no funding for a future BRAC. I think all of us are still digesting the last BRAC and understand how expensive it was. I think it is important for you to know that we will repeat in our bill, through your amendment, what you put in the authorization bill, which would make it quite clear to the administration.

Mr. WITTMAN. I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, although I am not opposed to his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make just a couple of points.

The gentleman noted that the last BRAC in 2005, if I am correct, is not going to save money until 2018. That implies it is going to save money in 2018. The concern I have is we do have to think about the future budgets for the Department of Defense, and sometimes we have to make hard decisions

in years like 2014 so that we can begin to accrue savings in the out-years.

I mentioned in my opening statements and more than once over the last couple of days—but I feel compelled to do it again—that I do have a concern about Congress' continued failure to confront our long-term fiscal challenges relative to the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense proposed significant initiatives, including military pay adjustments, the restructuring of TRICARE, changes in commissaries, the retirement of several weapons programs—the A-10, the Kiowa Warriors, and others—to provide for future flexibility and to meet our national security strategy.

A number of the proposals—I am not saying they all have incredible value—do possess merit, but with few exceptions, these proposals have not gained any traction in Congress. Most have been excluded in language, prohibiting or postponing the start in the most recently passed National Defense Authorization Act. I certainly don't dismiss the results and impacts on many Members' congressional districts, but, again, I don't think we should foreclose any options to consider in order to possibly save money in the out-years.

I would make the observation, although I am not going to vote against the gentleman's amendment, that we have got to stop saying "no" to everything. We have got to start saying "yes" to some things, but, unfortunately, for the last 2 days, all we have been doing is saying, "Don't do anything."

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on this issue as well as for the chairman's support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, now is not the time for BRAC. Due to the passage of the Budget Control Act, our military is facing unprecedented cuts which, I believe, could jeopardize our national defense—maintenance is being deferred; force structure is being reduced to levels we haven't seen since before World War II; training is being deferred as well. A BRAC would siphon precious defense dollars away from our military at a time when the ultimate end strength is uncertain.

We should learn from past lessons. We are still paying for the last BRAC. In 2005, a BRAC was approved. It was supposed to cost \$21 billion, but in fact, it is actually costing taxpayers \$35 billion. We are still paying off the last BRAC. Now is not the time to take the precious dollars that need to be going to our men and women in uniform and spend them on a BRAC, especially when we have not determined the ultimate force end strength at this point.

What are we not going to spend money on for our defense if we okay a

BRAC? Are our men and women in uniform not going to get the equipment they need? Are we going to cease even more training? Are we going to just mothball further platforms? Are we going to cut the benefits to our military families?

We need every dollar in defense right now to go to protect our national defense, not to reduce our future options that we may need. With all of the threats facing our country—and as we watch TV now, we see all of the threats that are in the world—we need to make sure we have a strong national defense and that we not further weaken it and not weaken our options. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, in closing, we are at a decisive point.

As you know, right now, we are bringing equipment back from Afghanistan. We are resetting our force, and we are training them for the next missions that they are about to face. Those efforts take resources, and we cannot forget that we have to devote those resources on the list of priorities. Making sure that our men and women are properly trained and that the equipment they have is properly operating and maintained is critical to this Nation's readiness. That should be job one. That is not to say we shouldn't look at saving money elsewhere through infrastructure, but we must restore lost readiness now. That is where those funds need to go. We certainly can look at infrastructure later, but now is the time to make sure we maintain readiness.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the chairman of the subcommittee and, as well, the ranking member for the courtesy of your staffs and for the work that this committee is doing on behalf of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the ranking member of Homeland Security's

Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, working on human trafficking and smuggling, as I come from a city that has been called the epicenter of human trafficking—Houston, Texas. So I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity to put forward this simple and straightforward amendment that affirms the example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on Earth.

The amendment says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

I am joined on this amendment by Congressman STEVE STOCKMAN, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL, Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, and Congressman JOHN CONYERS.

Mr. Chairman, recently, I was proud to support House Resolutions 573 and 617, strongly condemning the ongoing violence and systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria that have been carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the April 15, 2014, kidnapping of more than 200 young girls who were kidnapped from the Chibok school by Boko Haram.

□ 2115

This is what the people of northeast Nigeria are facing every single day. Since 2013, more than 4,500 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram.

In addition, it took the United States 25 months after the first two Americans were attacked, and 1 year after the third and fourth Americans were targeted, before Boko Haram was designated a foreign terrorist organization.

It took the United Kingdom 16 months from the time its first citizen was killed by Boko Haram to legally brand them as terrorists.

It took the United Nations 33 months after the United Nations headquarters in Nigeria was bombed before Boko Haram was sanctioned as an al Qaeda-linked terror group.

On June 2, 2014, the European Union finally designated Boko Haram as a terror group.

NGOs have indicated that, in April, the average deaths were hundreds a week by Boko Haram, and later it was an average of 100 deaths a day.

So they couldn't do enough killing, killing of Christians and Muslims and journalists and health care providers and relief workers and schoolchildren. They had to kidnap 200 children, 200 girls.

The international community, working with the African Union, is assisting the government of Nigeria in locating and rescuing the missing girls, bringing an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror, and ensuring that they are brought to justice because of their crimes against humanity.

On May 21, 2014, the President notified the Congress that, pursuant to the

authority vested in him by article 2, section 2, as the Commander in Chief, and to conduct foreign relations, that he had directed deployment of approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of our 200 girls reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria.

The President informed the Congress that these personnel would support the operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions over northern Nigeria and the surrounding area. The force will remain in Chad until its support in resolving the kidnapping situation is no longer needed.

My simple amendment indicates that nothing in this bill will contravene the President's authority while these girls are missing.

Mr. Chairman, four Members of Congress, over June 12 to June 16, went to Nigeria. We were in northeast Nigeria. We were in the Borno State, in Abuja. We visited with the victims, the girls who escaped from the Chibok school. They drove 2 days to meet with us to tell us of the outrageous violence, and how they were laid on the ground, and the Boko Haram, pointing AK-47s at their heads, said: Answer my questions or die.

Then we met a woman whose throat was sliced, and her husband, a police officer, was decapitated.

The enforcement, the military, and the police officers of Nigeria need our help.

No, this is not an encouragement or a suggestion at all for boots on the ground. It is a simple collaboration that will stop the siege of Boko Haram that is spreading across Africa and the surrounding area. It is almost like the unknowing understanding of the Taliban by many in America before 9/11.

Boko Haram is a disaster waiting to happen for the continent. In a state like Nigeria that is about to be 440 million people, that has a 7 percent growth rate, and is one of the most prosperous nations in Africa, it has 60 percent poverty, it has 10 million children out of school. And Boko Haram is burning hospitals, schools, Christian churches, mosques, and killing pastors and emirs.

So this amendment is to remind us, just as Hubert Humphrey said, "People are the great issue of the 20th century." Now they are the great issue of the 21st century.

It is time to treat our boys and girls and women with respect.

As I close, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, to stop the headlines like this, as Boko Haram continues to rage across Nigeria. I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VIS-CLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. Chair, it was a proud occasion when the House passed H. Res. 573 and H.R. 617, resolutions strongly condemning the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the April 15, 2014 kidnapping of more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram.

The victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers. And schoolchildren.

The international community, working with the African Union, is assisting the Government of Nigeria in locating and rescuing the missing girls, bringing an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror, and ensuring that its crimes against humanity are documented so its leaders can be held accountable.

On May 21, 2014, the President notified the Congress that pursuant to the authority vested in him by Article II, Section 2, as Commander in Chief and to conduct foreign relations, that he had directed the deployment of "approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of over 200 schoolgirls who are reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria."

The President informed the Congress that "these personnel will support the operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions over northern Nigeria and the surrounding area. The force will remain in Chad until its support in resolving the kidnapping situation is no longer required."

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply makes clear that nothing in the bill contravenes the President's authority to take the actions just described which he has determined to be in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.

Boko Haram's outrageous conduct will not be tolerated or overlooked for not only is it a violation of the girls' human rights, it is also contrary to United States policy which supports and promotes equal access to education and economic opportunity for women and girls.

"People are the great issue of the 20th century," declared, then-Senator Hubert Humphrey in 1948.

Mr. Chair, the well-being of people remains the great issue of the 21st century.

And there is no better measure of any society than the way it treats its women and girls and boys and families.

Boko Haram understands that when Nigerian girls are educated, Nigerian women can succeed; and when Nigerian women succeed, Nigeria succeeds.

And that is why it is so important that the United States help Nigeria ensure that Boko Haram fails.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer weapons to the Palestinian Authority.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, simply, this amendment says, as the gentlelady read, "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer weapons to the Palestinian Authority."

I would like to express why I brought this amendment. I take you back, Mr. Chairman, to April 23, 2014, when Fatah and Hamas unified within the Palestinian Authority in the Palestinian organization. That unification brought about a terrorist-designated organization, a foreign terrorist organization, joined together with Fatah. This is April 23.

On June 6 of 2014, State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said: "We will work with and fund the new Palestinian Authority government."

So what that means is, they have decided, for the first time, that our taxpayers' borrowed money is going to be committed to a terrorist organization.

1997 was when Hamas was designated as a foreign terrorist organization. Since 1997, Hamas has launched tens of thousands of rockets from the Gaza Strip into Israel.

Khaled Mashal of Hamas said the reconciliation of the two organizations, Fatah and Hamas, will consolidate the resistance. Not bring about peace, but consolidate the resistance.

We can't afford and cannot fund a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas because they are a foreign trade organization.

I would bring to the attention of the floor, Mr. Chairman, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006, which bans funding to a government that includes Hamas until they meet three different conditions.

One is that they recognize Israel.

Two is that they renounce violence.

And three is that they accept previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements.

They have done none of those three things and, therefore, can't qualify for this funding. So we cannot fund a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas because they are a foreign trade organization, because they do not recognize the Jewish state, they do not recognize their right to exist.

But prior to June 2, 2014, the U.S. has never recognized a government that includes Hamas, and so that is why I bring this amendment.

And I would point out that the administration has been isolating Israel in a number of ways. Secretary Kerry, in April of this year, compared Israel to an apartheid state. I have been there a number of times and I have not seen that. I don't recognize that, and I don't think it is true. I think Israel would reject that, and I would encourage them to do so.

But in May of 2011, President Obama said that Israel should return to its 1967 borders. That would be indefensible for Israel to do that.

So we need to stick with the existing statute, the 2006 Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act. And this amendment cuts off funding to that military supply and support.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Grayson Amendment 5.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to detain, without conviction, any person for more than 15 years at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment at the desk is simple. It reads as you just read it.

As you know, Guantanamo was opened for business, so to speak, in January of 2002. It is now June of 2014.

My amendment seems to give some kind of clue as to how long we, a free people who respect freedom, are willing to incarcerate and imprison people who have been accused of no crime, have faced no judge, no jury, and have never been subject to the American system of justice.

My amendment has no immediate effect during this fiscal year. As it says, it is limited to persons who have served for 15 years or more at Guantanamo Bay. The facility itself is only 12 years old.

What this amendment does do is ensure that no funds will be made available by this bill that are carried over to future fiscal years and are then used to imprison anyone for 15 years or longer if they haven't been accused, much less convicted of any crime.

I would hope that we, as a free people, would understand that principle and agree that this is reasonable.

Nobody, nobody, foreign or American, should be subject to imprisonment for more than 15 years without ever even facing his accusers, much less being convicted of a crime. That is particularly true under the auspices of the U.S. Government because we are a people of laws, not a people of people.

This amendment is silent as to whether detainees could be convicted under an article III court, a military tribunal, a commission, or some other form of court with the authority to render any judgment.

It simply says that a person must be convicted of a crime or must be released from Guantanamo if they have served 15 years, 15 years, Mr. Chairman, of detention.

We have speedy trial rules in this country that guarantee the right to face your accusers within 6 months. These prisoners, both the innocent ones and the guilty ones, have been incarcerated without hearing any charges against them now for more than a decade.

I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and recognize the dignity of all human beings, whether or not they have the privilege to be American citizens.

In the year 1209, in a French city called Beziers, a monk oversaw the Albigensian crusade. The crusaders were brought into that city to deal with the heretics, the Albigensians, who lived in that French town. Arnaud Amelric, a monk, was asked: What should we do with these people, these Christians who are like us who don't believe exactly what we believe?

He said: Kill them all and let God sort it out.

That has stood for many years as a signal that we must expect more from civilized people than that. We are holding these people in that prison, all of them, the innocent and the guilty apparently, under current rules, forever and ever and ever.

What is worse, killing them all and letting God sort it out, or holding them forever and not letting them ever meet their God but remain in prison for their entire lives?

I submit to you that we Americans are better than this. There has to be some kind of limitation.

This amendment will not force the release of anyone imminently, but will be a signal to all mankind that we, the American people, we retain our dignity and our humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Our Nation has invested millions of dollars in building state-of-the-art, humane, safe, and I may say, air-condi-

tioned facilities to detain and prosecute the terrorist detainees at Guantanamo.

In order to close that facility, we need to know what the President intends to do with those terrorist detainees who are too dangerous to release but could not be tried.

They had an opportunity to prosecute. What has been going on for the last 6 or 7 years?

How will he ensure that the terrorists transferred overseas don't return to the fight?

No way, apparently, he can reassure us of that because plenty have, and they have killed a lot of our soldiers in the process.

And what will he do with terrorists we capture in the future, like the one we captured the other day in Libya?

Well, we know what he does. He brings them back to this country, and they are prosecuted as common criminals, not as enemy combatants.

He hasn't answered those questions, so our committee is just as adamant as the authorizing committee in opposition to this amendment. I strongly oppose this amendment, and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2130

Mr. GRAYSON. I would respectfully submit that, on the gentleman's logic, there is no longer any distinction between the innocent and the guilty.

Those who are at Guantanamo Bay undoubtedly contain both innocent and guilty, but those categories, under the gentleman's logic, do not even apply to them any longer. They are simply captives forever and ever, going untried until they themselves decide to end their life, and we permit it. That is a fundamentally undignified view of the human conditions.

Whatever these people may be, American or not American, they are not just innocent until proven guilty, but on the gentleman's logic, they are not just guilty until proven innocent. They are guilty, guilty, guilty—no matter what.

That is something that is fundamentally unfair to them and to us and has cast an aspersion and a blotch on the American reputation throughout the world. That is why I call on this to end.

I am not saying that these people need to be released. I am saying that they need to be tried. Let's get to the bottom of it and determine if they are guilty or innocent. For God's sake, let's stop punishing the innocent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let's remember the innocent people who were killed on September 11, 2001. How about justice for them?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, of course, nothing that we do here today is likely to bring any of those victims back; but as President Lincoln once said, It is for we, the living—we, the living, that carry forth the principles of justice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by an officer or employee of the United States to query a collection of foreign intelligence information acquired under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) using a United States person identifier.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to queries for foreign intelligence information authorized under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805; 1842; 1881b; 1881c; 1881d), or title 18, United States Code, regardless of under what Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authority it was collected.

(c) Except as provided for in subsection (d), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 1801(m) of title 50, United States Code) alter its product or service to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 1801(f) of title 50, United States Code) of any user of said product or service for said agencies.

(d) Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the American people are sick of being spied on. Our Founding Fathers wrote an important provision into the Bill of Rights—the Fourth Amendment—and that requires probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can snoop on any American.

During the debate on the USA FREEDOM Act, we knew that more work was needed to ensure Americans' privacy rights are protected. That is why our bipartisan group has joined together to shut surveillance backdoors that do not meet the expectations of our constituents or the standards required by the Constitution.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to know that the Director of National Intelligence has confirmed publicly that the government searches vast amounts of data, including the content of emails and telephone calls, without individualized suspicion or probable cause when it comes to U.S. persons.

Last week, the director of the FBI testified under oath, before the Judiciary Committee, that this information is used for prosecution and without a warrant.

This amendment is simple. It allows us to get the bad guys, but it also says use probable cause and the Fourth Amendment. It also closes a backdoor to technology holes.

The broad support for this, I think, shows why it is important for Mr. SEN-SENRENNER of Wisconsin; myself; Mr. CONYERS of Michigan; Mr. POE of Texas; Ms. GABBARD; Mr. JORDAN of Ohio; Mr. O'Rourke; Mr. AMASH; of course, Mr. MASSIE; Mr. HOLT; Mr. NADLER; Mr. PETRI; Ms. DELBENE; Mr. FARTHERHOLD; Mr. SANFORD; and Mr. BUTTERFIELD—this spans all over this House of Representatives, from right to left, with Members saying: yes, we need to protect our country, but we also need to honor our Constitution and especially the Fourth Amendment.

We started this Congress by reading the Constitution of the United States aloud in this Chamber. Let's finish this bill by making sure that we honor that Constitution by adopting this amendment.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I will submit for the RECORD the letter from the Director of National Intelligence that my colleague from California referred to.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, Mar. 28, 2014.

Hon. Ron Wyden,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: During the January 29, 2014, Worldwide Threat hearing, you cited declassified court documents from 2011 indicating that NSA sought and obtained the authority to query information collected under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act (FISA), using U.S. person identifiers, and asked whether any such queries had been conducted for the communications of specific Americans.

As reflected in the August 2013 Semiannual Assessment of Compliance with Procedures and Guidelines Issued Pursuant to Section 702, which we declassified and released on August 21, 2013, there have been queries, using U.S. person identifiers, of communications lawfully acquired to obtain foreign intelligence by targeting non U.S. persons reasonably believed to be located outside the U.S. pursuant to Section 702 of FISA. These queries were performed pursuant to minimization procedures approved by the FISA Court as consistent with the statute and the Fourth Amendment. As you know, when Congress reauthorized Section 702, the proposal to restrict such queries was specifically raised and ultimately not adopted.

For further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Deirdre M. Walsh in the Office of Legislative Affairs, at (703) 275-2474.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER.

Mr. MASSIE. At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's

amendment. This is our Appropriations bill. There is nothing in this amendment about funding. You won't see one dollar sign or numeral. The goal was to change policy—that is why they are here—and the application of the law without the oversight of the authorizing committees. The authorizers ought to be dealing with this issue.

It is my pleasure to yield such time as he may wish to consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary, to respond to this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, last month, the House passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, with overwhelming bipartisan support. This amendment undoes the carefully crafted reforms that this body passed, with overwhelming support.

A similar amendment regarding section 702 was offered and rejected by the House Judiciary Committee during its markup of H.R. 3361.

The bipartisan legislation passed by the House last month was closely negotiated on a bipartisan basis with the House Intelligence Committee, House leadership, and the intelligence community—to create a product that provides real, meaningful reforms to intelligence-gathering programs, while ensuring that the operational capabilities of the intelligence community are protected.

H.R. 3361 explicitly codifies existing minimization procedures for section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act that requires the intelligence community to minimize the collection and prohibit the retention and dissemination of wholly domestic communications.

H.R. 3361 also prohibits the government from using communications to or from a United States person or a person who appears to be located in the United States, except where the communication relates to a target under section 702 or to protect against an immediate threat to human life.

The intelligence community is strictly prohibited from using section 702 of the FISA Amendments Acts to target a U.S. person. If a U.S. person is the target of intelligence gathering under FISA, this must, at all times, be carried out pursuant to an individualized court order based upon probable cause.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The USA FREEDOM Act that reformed the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was the product of nearly a year of carefully considered negotiation and debate. It passed the House last month with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 303 votes, but now, we have an amendment to an appropriations bill that makes major legislative changes to FISA with only 10 min-

utes of debate, and it makes our country less safe.

It would prohibit the urgent search of lawfully-collected information to thwart a bomb plot against a synagogue in Los Angeles, a church in Maryland, or the New York Stock Exchange.

It has no emergency exceptions, and it basically says that what you can do to stop a criminal in this country, you can't do to stop a terrorist. That is wrong. We cannot allow this to happen.

We will continue to work on FISA and our other national security laws to maximize privacy and civil liberties, especially for U.S. persons, but we must do so carefully and deliberately. We must make sure to also keep our country and our allies safe from terrorist attacks.

Ultimately, while I applaud these Members for continuing to look for ways to reform our intelligence laws, we shouldn't be doing this on an appropriations bill with only 10 minutes of debate.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is correct. This was in the original FREEDOM Act, and it was stripped out in his committee. That is why many of the Members who originally sponsored the FREEDOM Act did not, in fact, vote for the final version, and I would argue that it was not legislated.

The final version of the FREEDOM Act was done behind closed doors, and when it came to this floor, we would have loved to have offered amendments, but the rules were written such that we could not amend it.

Legislators from 435 districts had no say in the final bill, and that is why we are here tonight with this amendment, to reinsert this provision which over 150 Members of this body sponsored.

At this point, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, our number one priority is keeping the American people safe. We do that by focusing our resources on those who actually pose a threat to our safety, while upholding the freedoms and civil liberties of the American people, not by continuing this dragnet spying on millions of Americans.

There is no evidence to date that these programs have made our country more secure. Not a single taxpayer dollar should be used to fund a program that spies on innocent Americans, violating the principles of liberty and freedom that so many have fought and given their lives for.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the NSA has shown they will always interpret the law to the extent that allows them to seize the information. That is why the law has to be much more clear to the NSA. We all must remember that the NSA was violating the PATRIOT Act, as written.

This amendment does something that is very concrete. It tells the NSA: Get a warrant. Get a warrant through the front door. You get a warrant through the backdoor. You can't spy on Americans unless you get a warrant. That is what this amendment does, and I support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas is correct. The American people can be kept safe, and we can follow the Constitution. We don't have to disregard it, and that is what this amendment would allow us to do, to keep the American people safe while protecting their civil liberties.

There are two provisions here, and they both close backdoors. One backdoor currently allows, without probable cause or a warrant, for the NSA to query a database of American persons' information. This is wrong. They should have a warrant.

The other part of this amendment would prevent money from being spent to fund companies to put backdoors into products. When the government causes these companies to intentionally make defects in their products, they make Americans less safe. They make Americans' data less safe, and they compromise the quality of American goods overseas.

Ultimately, this is about the Constitution, and if you believe in the Constitution, if you believe that it is still valid, if you think we can honor the Fourth Amendment and that we can still keep people safe, then I urge you to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the bill passed by this House honors the Fourth Amendment and protects the rights of American citizens. At the same time, Islamic radical terrorists are on the march in Iraq, and the leader has publicly threatened to attack America, Syria has become a vortex of jihadists from across the globe, and the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Homeland Security have warned of the growing threat these jihadists pose to our own homeland. State control has collapsed in Libya, and rival gangs of radical terrorists have established safe havens that rival those in Afghanistan prior to 2001.

Meanwhile, in Afghanistan, the Taliban, Haqqani Network, and al Qaeda continue to fight. Moreover, the administration has released the Taliban Five from Guantanamo, emboldening the terrorists. The terrorist danger is grave and growing. The terrorist threat is not contained overseas. The U.S. homeland remains a prime aspiration and target.

This amendment would create a blind spot for the intelligence community

tracking terrorists with direct connections to the U.S. homeland. This amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect national security than constitutionally required and create an impediment to the government's ability to locate threat information already in its possession. Such an impediment would put American lives at risk of another terrorist attack.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and stand by the legislation passed. It is also being considered in the Senate and there will be further negotiations, but this—this—contradicts the intent of the House and endangers America's national security.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, this amendment answers questions millions of Americans have asked: Will we stop the government's unconstitutional searches of Americans' stored communications? Will we prohibit the government from deliberately sabotaging the security of the internet and America's technology products?

This amendment would do both while still giving the government all the authority it needs to collect foreign intelligence on real threats. It is a first step towards reversing the current government paradigm of treating our people as suspects first, and citizens second. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bipartisan amendment.

It has been over a year now since the nation learned of the scope of the National Security Agency's vast surveillance programs targeting global communications, and thus the communications of every American. These programs have been executed in the absence of true, probing Congressional oversight, and they have been repeatedly rubber-stamped by a secret court that has too often acted as an enabler of this domestic spying rather than a check on it.

Earlier this spring, the House passed a bill—the USA Freedom Act—that if enacted into law would have the effect of essentially enshrining these unconstitutional programs into law. While I hope the Senate will either reject or substantially improve that legislation, there is no guarantee that the USA Freedom Act or any other stand-alone NSA reform legislation will pass the Congress this year. That is why I and over a dozen of my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, have brought this amendment to the House floor tonight. I should also note that this amendment is supported by dozens of groups from across the political spectrum, as well as some of America's leading technology companies, including Google.

This amendment answers questions millions of Americans have asked: will we stop the government's unconstitutional searches of Americans' stored communications? Will we prohibit the government from deliberately sabotaging the security of the internet and America's technology products? This amendment would do both while still giving the government all the authority it needs to collect foreign intelligence on real threats.

The first part of this amendment would prohibit the government from conducting warrantless searches of the communications of Americans collected under Section 702 of

the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. One of the predictions I and others made in 2008 when this provision became law was that it would be misused for the "reverse targeting" of Americans' communications while collecting against foreigners. As we now know, that is exactly what happened, and those communications—billions of phone calls, emails, text messages and the like—now sit on National Security Agency servers, available for search without a warrant. This amendment would bar the NSA from using any funds in this act to conduct any search of stored communications of Americans collected under Sec. 702 of FISA, thus protecting the privacy and Constitutional rights of all Americans.

The second part of this amendment would prohibit the government from forcing American technology companies to build in "back doors" to their products that would compromise the encryption and privacy safeguards built into them. Early this year, published reports revealed that RSA, which provides the SecureID remote login devices used by House Members and staff, had, at NSA's insistence, built in such "back doors" to some of its other products that compromised the privacy and encryption features of the devices in question. This amendment would prohibit that practice, thus helping to restore public confidence in the security and integrity of American produced high technology products.

This amendment is a first step towards reversing the current government paradigm of treating our people as suspects first, and citizens second. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Rep. JIM SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin, Rep. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and the other sponsors of this amendment for their continued leadership on the effort to roll back dragnet surveillance of United States citizens.

Last month, a broad, bipartisan majority passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act. That bill rightly ends domestic bulk collection.

But, as I said then, ending bulk collection is only part of the work that must be done to fully reform government surveillance.

This amendment closes the "backdoor surveillance" loophole—through which the government queries U.S. person information without a warrant.

This amendment also prohibits the government from mandating the creation of vulnerabilities in commercial products and services for later exploitation.

Together, these changes end two demonstrated threats to our privacy and civil liberties—without any measurable loss to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I am proud to be a leading co-sponsor of the Sensenbrenner/Lofgren/Massie amendment and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The NSA must stop conducting illegal 'backdoor searches' into the communications of U.S. citizens. Congress must adopt the Sensenbrenner/Lofgren/Massie amendment and make sure that this loophole is closed in the law. For too long, the NSA has misused authority granted under section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act, which was meant only to authorize spying on foreigners. However, the NSA has misused this authority to search emails, pictures, videos, and other internet

traffic of innocent Americans. This practice is clearly unconstitutional and violates the Fourth Amendment, which protects against unreasonable search and seizure, and normally requires a court-issued warrant. Clearly, this is not how Congress intended the law to be applied.

After the passage of the USA Freedom Act, this amendment is the logical next step to prevent improper surveillance. I will continue to work to improve our nation's privacy laws and to ensure that this Administration, and all those that follow it, respect the constitutional rights of all Americans.

As I said at the time, the USA Freedom Act certainly did not give us everything we wanted or needed. It was far from perfect, but it was an important step forward. We must not leave in place a framework that leads to the dragnet surveillance of our citizens.

During the last several months, I have worked with my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to pass the USA Freedom Act. While that bill contains some significant reforms, such as ending NSA's bulk collection of metadata from Americans, more reforms are still needed. And this amendment is an important step in the right direction.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support this amendment to the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. I would like to thank Representatives LOFGREN and MASSIE for their work on this issue.

To my colleagues who supported the USA FREEDOM Act, this amendment further defends the constitutional rights we voted to protect. To cosponsors who didn't believe the FREEDOM Act went far enough, this amendment reclaims an important protection stripped from the original bill.

I believe the amended USA FREEDOM Act is an important step toward striking the proper balance between privacy and security, and I look forward to seeing it signed into law. But as I said at the time of that vote, the FREEDOM Act was a first step—not a final step—in our efforts for reform.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act prohibits the government from targeting U.S. communications. The Administration believes, however, that as long as it incidentally or inadvertently collects Americans' communications, it can read our emails and listen to our phone calls without any judicial process at all.

The Administration has admitted it violates our rights in this way, but it refuses to say how often or to what extent.

The Obama Administration knows that FISA does not authorize collection of wholly domestic communications. It also knows that the content of our communications are, by and large, protected by the Fourth Amendment. But the Administration nevertheless believes that as long as those communications are inadvertently collected, it has the right to disregard the law and the Constitution.

This amendment says that the Fourth Amendment means what it says and there should be no shortcuts around it. For those who believe the sky will fall and U.S. security will be undermined, it has only been since 2011 that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court opened the backdoor and allowed these illegal searches. This amendment closes that door.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARROW OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled "Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria", dated January 27, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on what is undoubtedly the most important bill we pass on an annual basis.

I rise in support of the bipartisan Barrow-Benishkek amendment to H.R. 4870, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015. This is a straightforward amendment that provides the certainty that our Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps needs to select, educate, train, and commission college students to be officers and leaders of character.

In the coming days, the Army is expected to initiate the closure of some ROTC programs. On that list could be any of the 275 ROTC host programs located in every State in the Union. Unfortunately, for thousands of cadets in these programs, the Army's timeline for closure is too short. According to the plans, the Army would close ROTC programs as early as next June. That is simply not fair for the students in these programs or their host universities.

This amendment would simply delay closure of these ROTC programs by 1 year. We would be doing everything we can to make sure that our ROTC programs and our cadets succeed. They are

the next generation of Army leadership, and 1 year of delay would give all of us the certainty that we need to do so.

At this time, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), my partner in this measure.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I co-introduced with my friend, Mr. BARROW, to prevent the closure of Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs across this country.

ROTC programs not only benefit the Army, they strengthen communities and provide opportunities to promising young students. However, in October of this past year, the Army released a list of 13 ROTC programs slated for closure following the 2014-2015 school year.

Following advocacy from Members, including Chairman ROGERS, we were able instead to get the Army to institute a new evaluation system for ROTC programs. This amendment simply holds the Army to their promise of giving these programs enough time to institute changes.

One of these valuable programs is located at Northern Michigan University. Over the 45-year history of the program, Northern Michigan has seen 400 students graduate and go on to military service.

A closure of the NMU ROTC program next school year would prove especially unfair to the cadets currently in the program. These young men and women have worked hard in order to be accepted and maintain their spot. Let's give them a chance to succeed and serve the country they love. Support this amendment. Please vote for it.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for all the reasons given, I urge a "yes" vote on the bipartisan Barrow-Benishkek amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels unless such planning, design, refurbishing, or construction is specifically authorized by law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. This is a pretty straightforward amendment, Mr. Chairman, that would simply require

that any effort under the Defense Production Act to build a hundreds-of-millions-of-dollars refinery for biofuels could not happen until it was authorized by this body.

It is not allowed to stop this from happening. It simply means that the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture, who both are funding this misguided attempt, in my opinion, couldn't do that until they bring a business case to this body for consideration.

I would think my colleagues on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee as well as the MilCon Subcommittee would be offended by this backdoor approach to spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a project of dubious value.

The Defense Production Act is a World War II, post-World War II vintage program supervised by the Financial Services Committee—not the Defense, not the Armed Services Committee or the Subcommittees on Appropriation—but the Financial Services Committee.

There is currently a refinery that is being proposed to be joint-funded by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense to build a biofuels refinery. Neither of these agencies' core competencies is in this arena. They each have their own core competencies, and it has absolutely nothing to do with biofuels.

I would argue that the Department of Energy—if anybody—should be the one who authorizes this work, but they have got a dubious distinction, as well, with decisions such as Solyndra and others of making really poor decisions.

The other side will argue that this somehow protects the Department of Defense from price shocks on oil and gas that they have simply purchased. They have never brought us that business case. We have no clue what the break-even point on biofuels is against some equivalent cost for fossil-based fuels. Currently, they are spending somewhere between \$16 and \$27 a gallon for algae-based jet fuel versus the \$3 to \$4 a gallon commercially available.

These folks who are proponents of biofuels are not proponents of better alternative resources like coal to liquids. So I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment to require an authorization for the spending of some \$300-plus million on a refinery that is, in my view, of dubious distinction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this is the third iteration of a very similar amendment, so my comments will also mirror those that I have made earlier in the debate.

The first thing I would make clear to the gentleman from Texas, though, is I am not going to suggest in any way,

shape, or form that his amendment is offered to protect the oil and gas industry of his State. As I mentioned earlier this evening, the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America is in the First Congressional District of Indiana, and I am very proud of that. I tell my constituents that we need a matrix of fuels, and while we work from using carbon almost exclusively, we are also a coal State in Indiana. We are not to foreclose our options, and particularly for the Department of Defense.

Given the fact that the Department is the largest consumer of energy on planet Earth as far as a single entity, I do think we ought to also allow them to examine what is the best matrix and mix of fuels for the particular missions and locations that they find themselves in. For these reasons, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would not take offense—I should—but I won't take offense that the gentleman suggests that somehow this amendment has anything to do whatsoever with respect to oil and gas that we produce in Texas. When you don't like the merits of your own argument, you go ahead and attack the folks on the other side, and I understand that technique.

The truth of the matter is the Department of Defense can, in fact, make judgments for themselves once a product is available to them at commercial products. This just prevents them from going ahead and trying to build something, build up a market and build a fuel that no one else wants. It is only available here in the United States. It would not be available anywhere else in the world to fuel our airplanes, or our ships, or our tanks and other things.

So, this is a misguided attempt driven by the White House on this green initiative that is spending millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money, and it is a waste every time they do that.

I would argue that the better argument is to say "no" to this, allow the Department of Defense to spend their dollars, as has been said previously, on guns, tanks, ships, and salaries for our soldiers. This is a wrong-headed tip. It ought to be authorized by the HASC and by the Senate equivalent, and these two subcommittees on Appropriations ought to be offended by this backdoor approach at spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a program that has no oversight.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I just want to correct the statement that my colleague just made. At the outset of my remarks, I was careful to note, because in the gentleman's original remarks he said that some would suggest he had offered his amendment to defend the oil and gas industry. I specifically said I know that is why he did not do that in the amendment and made the further point that the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America is in my district, so I would in no way infer that. So I want the RECORD to be very clear that I am not impugning the motives of the gentleman who offered the amendment. I simply rose in disagreement with his amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I did misunderstand you. I thought you were saying I was disqualified from offering an amendment like this because I simply represent west Texas, which is the leading oil and gas producer in our country. So if I misunderstood you, I will accept that.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. COTTON of Arkansas.

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 31 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 33 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

An amendment by Mr. FORTENBERRY of Nebraska.

An amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 34 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 300, noes 114, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—300

Amash	Gardner	McMorris
Amodel	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bachmann	Gibbs	McNerney
Barber	Gibson	Meadows
Barletta	Gingrey (GA)	Meeks
Barr	Gohmert	Messer
Barrow (GA)	Goodlatte	Mica
Barton	Gosar	Michaud
Beatty	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Miller, George
Bentivolio	Grayson	Mullin
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Bilirakis	Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Nadler
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Neal
Black	Grimm	Negrete McLeod
Blackburn	Guthrie	Nolan
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Nugent
Boustany	Hahn	Nunes
Brady (PA)	Hall	Olson
Brady (TX)	Hanabusa	Palazzo
Braley (IA)	Harper	Pallone
Bridenstine	Harris	Pascarell
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Broun (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Buchanan	Himes	Perlmutter
Burgess	Hinojosa	Perry
Bustos	Holding	Peters (CA)
Butterfield	Holt	Peters (MI)
Camp	Honda	Peterson
Capps	Horsford	Petri
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Hudson	Pittenger
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Pitts
Cartwright	Huizenga (MI)	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Pompeo
Chabot	Jackson Lee	Posey
Chaffetz	Jeffries	Price (GA)
Ciilline	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Cleaver	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Roe (TN)
Coble	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Cohen	Keating	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Kelly (IL)	Rooney
Conyers	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kennedy	Roskam
Costa	Kildee	Ross
Cotton	Kilmer	Rothfus
Courtney	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Ruiz
Crowley	King (NY)	Runyan
Cuellar	Kingston	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Kinzing (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Daines	Kuster	Salmon
Davis (CA)	Labrador	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis, Danny	LaMalfa	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Langevin	Schakowsky
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Delaney	Latta	Schneider
DeLauro	Levin	Schock
DeSantis	Lewis	Schrader
Deutch	Lipinski	Schweikert
Dingell	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Loeb sack	Scott, Austin
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Duffy	Lowey	Serrano
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Sessions
Ellison	Luetkemeyer	Sewell (AL)
Ellmers	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Engel	(NM)	Sherman
Enyart	Lummis	Shimkus
Esty	Lynch	Shuster
Farenthold	Maffei	Simpson
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Fincher	Marino	Sires
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Smith (MO)
Foster	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Fox	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Frankel (FL)	McAllister	Southerland
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Speier
Gabbard	McCauley	Stewart
Gallego	McClintock	Stivers
Garamendi	McGovern	Stockman
Garcia	McHenry	Stutzman
	McIntyre	

Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Westmoreland
Terry	Veasey	Whitfield
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Williams
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Wasserman	Wolf
Tierney	Schultz	Woodall
Tipton	Waters	Yoho
Tonko	Weber (TX)	Young (AK)
Turner	Webster (FL)	
Upton	Wenstrup	

NOES—114

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Bachus	Garrett	Noem
Bass	Gowdy	O'Rourke
Becerra	Granger	Owens
Blumenauer	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Bucshon	Hanna	Quigley
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Reed
Calvert	Hensarling	Reichert
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Cantor	Higgins	Ribble
Capito	Huffman	Rigell
Carter	Hunter	Roby
Cassidy	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Chu	Issa	Rokita
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Clay	Jolly	Sanford
Cole	Joyce	Schwartz
Collins (NY)	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Kline	Slaughter
Connolly	Lance	Smith (NE)
Cooper	Connelly	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Latham	Takano
Culberson	Lee (CA)	Titus
DeBene	Lofgren	Tsongas
Denham	Long	Valadao
Dent	Maloney,	Van Hollen
DesJarlais	Carolyn	Velázquez
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Visclosky
Doggett	McColum	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	Walorski
Edwards	McKeon	Waxman
Eshoo	McKinley	Welch
Farr	Meehan	Wittman
Fleischmann	Meng	Womack
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Yarmuth
Flores	Miller, Gary	Yoder
Forbes	Moore	Young (IN)
Fortenberry	Moran	
	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Mulvaney	Scalise
Fudge	Nunnelee	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Walz
Lankford	Rangel	
Lujan Grisham	Richmond	
(NM)	Rush	

□ 1227

Messrs. WALDEN, ISSA, ADERHOLT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PITTS, CARSON, JOHNSON of Ohio, CHAFFETZ, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 184, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amodel	Graves (GA)	Perry
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Bachus	Green, Gene	Petri
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Barletta	Grimm	Pitts
Barr	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishek	Harris	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Black	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins	Rooney
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cantor	Jolly	Ross
Capito	Jones	Rothfus
Carter	Jordan	Royce
Cassidy	Joyce	Ruiz
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	King (NY)	Salmon
Coffman	Kingston	Sanchez, Loretta
Cole	Kinzing (IL)	Schock
Collins (GA)	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Lance	Sessions
Cotton	Latham	Shimkus
Cramer	Latta	Shuster
Crawford	Lipinski	Simpson
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Long	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Davis, Danny	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stewart
Denham	Marino	Stivers
Dent	Matheson	Stockman
DeSantis	McAllister	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCauley	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Turner
Ellmers	McKeon	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleischmann	McNerney	Walden
Fleming	Meadows	Walorski
Flores	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Williams
Gardner	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gibbs	Noem	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunes	Yoder
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoho
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOES—184

Amash	Braley (IA)	Cartwright
Bass	Broun (GA)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Bentivolio	Bustos	Ciilline
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clay
Bonamici	Carney	Cleaver
Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)	Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)
Capuano
Fudge
Kirkpatrick
Lankford
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Richmond
Rush

□ 2231

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—163

Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Schwartz
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

NOES—249

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman

Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner

Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan

Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (GA)
Capuano
Fudge
Kirkpatrick
Lankford
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Richmond

□ 2235

Mr. BARBER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 250, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—165

Amash
Barber
Bass

Beatty
Becerra
Benishke

Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Brady (PA)	Himes	Pastor (AZ)	Langevin	Paulsen	Shimkus	Duncan (TN)	Lee (CA)	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Payne	Latham	Pearce	Shuster	Edwards	Levin	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Holt	Pelosi	Latta	Perlmutter	Simpson	Ellison	Lewis	Rigell
Burgess	Honda	Peters (CA)	Lipinski	Perry	Smith (MO)	Engel	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Capps	Huffman	Petri	LoBiondo	Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)	Eshoo	Lofgren	Rooney
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)	Long	Peterson	Smith (NJ)	Esty	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Pocan	Lucas	Pittenger	Smith (TX)	Farr	Lowe	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Posey	Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Southerland	Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sanford
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley	Lummis	Poe (TX)	Stewart	Foster	Lynch	Sanborn
Cicilline	Jones	Rahall	Lynch	Pompeo	Stivers	Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ribble	Marchant	Price (GA)	Stutzman	Gabbard	Maloney, Carolyn	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rigell	Marino	Price (NC)	Terry	Garamendi	Maloney, Carolyn	Schiff
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher	Matheson	Reed	Thompson (PA)	Gibson	Massie	Schneider
Cleaver	Kildee	Roybal-Allard	McAllister	Reichert	Thornberry	Grayson	Matsui	Schrader
Coffman	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda T.	McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Tiberi	Green, Al	McClintock	Schwartz
Cohen	Kind	Sanford	McCaul	Rice (SC)	Tipton	Green, Gene	McCollum	Schweikert
Conyers	Kuster	Sarbanes	McHenry	Roby	Turner	Griffith (VA)	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Labrador	Schakowsky	McIntyre	Roe (TN)	Upton	Grijalva	McGovern	Scott, David
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Valadao	Gutiérrez	McMorris	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schneider	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Vargas	Hahn	Rodgers	Serrano
Daines	Lee (CA)	Schneider	McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Viscosky	Hanabusa	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Levin	Schrader	Rodgers	Rokita	Wagner	Hanna	Meng	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Schwartz	Meadows	Rooney	Walberg	Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Sires
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Schweikert	Meahan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden	Heck (WA)	Miller, George	Slaughter
DeGette	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Meeks	Roskam	Walorski	Herrera Beutler	Moore	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Messer	Ross	Wasserman	Higgins	Moran	Speier
DelBene	Lowe	Sensenbrenner	Mica	Rothfus	Schultz	Himes	Murphy (FL)	Stockman
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Serrano	Miller (FL)	Royce	Weber (TX)	Hinojosa	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Maffei	Shea-Porter	Miller (MI)	Ruiz	Webster (FL)	Holt	Napolitano	Takano
Doggett	Maloney, Carolyn	Sinema	Miller, Gary	Runyan	Wenstrup	Honda	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Sires	Moran	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland	Horsford	Negrete McLeod	Tierney
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Slaughter	Mullin	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield	Huelskamp	Nolan	Titus
Edwards	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Williams	Huffman	O'Rourke	Tonko
Ellison	McClintock	Speier	Neugebauer	Sánchez, Loretta	Wilson (SC)	Jackson Lee	Pallone	Tsongas
Eshoo	Matsui	Stockman	Noem	Scalise	Wittman	Jeffries	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Esty	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)	Nugent	Schock	Wolf	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Veasey
Farr	McDermott	Takano	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Womack	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Vela
Fattah	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Olson	Sessions	Woodall	Jones	Payne	Velázquez
Foster	McNerney	Tierney	Owens	Sewell (AL)	Yoder	Kaptur	Pelosi	Viscosky
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Titus	Palazzo	Sherman	Young (IN)	Keating	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Garamendi	Michaud	Tonko				Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)	Schultz
Garcia	Miller, George	Tsongas				Kennedy	Peters (MI)	Waters
Gibson	Moore	Van Hollen	Bishop (GA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Kildee	Petri	Waxman
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	Veasey	Capuano	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)	Welch
Green, Al	Nadler	Vela	Fudge	Mulvaney	Rush	Kind	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Velázquez	Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)	Kuster	Posey	Woodall
Grijalva	Neal	Waters	Lankford	Polis	Thompson (MS)	Labrador	Price (GA)	Yarmuth
Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod	Waxman			Walz	Langevin	Price (NC)	Yoho
Hahn	Nolan	Welch				Larsen (WA)	Quigley	
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)				Larson (CT)		
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Yarmuth						
Heck (WA)	Pascarell	Yoho						
Higgins		Young (AK)						

NOT VOTING—16

□ 2239

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 231, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—182

Aderholt	Connolly	Gowdy	Amash	Carney	Courtney	Costa	Hall
Amodei	Cook	Granger	Bass	Castor (FL)	Crowley	Cotton	Harper
Bachmann	Cooper	Graves (GA)	Beatty	Castro (TX)	Cummings	Cramer	Harris
Bachus	Costa	Graves (MO)	Becerra	Chu	Daines	Crawford	Hartzler
Barletta	Cotton	Griffin (AR)	Benishek	Cicilline	Davis, Danny	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Cramer	Griffith (VA)	Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeFazio	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Barrow (GA)	Crawford	Grimm	Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeGette	Culberson	Hensarling
Barton	Crenshaw	Guthrie	Brady (PA)	Clay	DeLauro	Davis (CA)	Holding
Bentivolio	Cuellar	Hall	Brady (IA)	Cleaver	DelBene	Davis, Rodney	Hoyer
Billirakis	Culberson	Hanna	Broun (GA)	Coffman	Deutch	Delaney	Hudson
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Rodney	Harpur	Burgess	Cohen	Dingell	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Harris	Capps	Connolly	Doggett	DeSantis	Hultgren
Black	Denham	Hartzler	Cárdenas	Conyers	Doyle	DesJarlais	Hunter
Blackburn	Dent	Hastings (WA)				Diaz-Balart	Hurt
Boustany	DeSantis	Heck (NV)				Duckworth	Israel
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Hensarling				Duffy	Issa
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler				Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Holding				Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Horsford				Enyart	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Hoyer				Brooks (AL)	Jolly
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers	Hudson				Brooks (IN)	Jordan
Buchanan	Engel	Huelskamp				Brown (FL)	Joyce
Bucshon	Enyart	Huizenga (MI)				Brownley (CA)	Kelly (PA)
Bustos	Farenthold	Hultgren				Buchanan	King (IA)
Butterfield	Fincher	Hunter				Bucshon	King (NY)
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Hurt				Bustos	Kingston
Calvert	Fleischmann	Issa				Butterfield	Kinzing (IL)
Camp	Fleming	Jenkins				Byrne	Kline
Campbell	Flores	Johnson (OH)				Calvert	Fox
Cantor	Forbes	Johnson, Sam				Camp	Fox
Capito	Fortenberry	Jolly				Campbell	Franks (AZ)
Carney	Fox	Jordan				Cantor	Frelinghuysen
Carson (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Joyce				Capito	Galleo
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)				Capito	Garcia
Cartwright	Gabbard	Kennedy				Carson (IN)	Gardner
Cassidy	Galleo	King (IA)				Carter	Garrett
Chabot	Gardner	King (NY)				Cartwright	Gerlach
Chaffetz	Garrett	Kingston				Cassidy	Gibbs
Clyburn	Gerlach	Kinzing (IL)				Chabot	Gingrey (GA)
Coble	Gibbs	Kline				Chaffetz	Goodlatte
Cole	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa				Clyburn	Gosar
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Lamborn				Coble	Gowdy
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Lance				Cole	Granger
Conaway	Gosar					Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)
						Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)
						Conaway	Griffin (AR)
						Cook	Grimm
						Cooper	Guthrie

NOES—231

Aderholt	Costa	Hall
Amodei	Cotton	Harper
Bachmann	Cramer	Harris
Bachus	Crawford	Hartzler
Barber	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Barr	Culberson	Hensarling
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Holding
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Hoyer
Bentivolio	Delaney	Hudson
Bera (CA)	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Billirakis	Dent	Hultgren
Bishop (NY)	DeSantis	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hurt
Black	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Blackburn	Duckworth	Issa
Boustany	Duffy	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Enyart	Jolly
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Jordan
Brown (FL)	Fincher	Joyce
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Bucshon	Fleming	King (NY)
Bustos	Flores	Kingston
Butterfield	Forbes	Kinzing (IL)
Byrne	Fortenberry	Kline
Calvert	Fox	LaMalfa
Camp	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Cantor	Galleo	Lance
Capito	Garcia	Latham
Carson (IN)	Gardner	Latta
Carter	Garrett	LoBiondo
Cartwright	Gerlach	Loeb sack
Cassidy	Gibbs	Lucas
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Lummis
Clyburn	Gosar	Maloney, Sean
Coble	Gowdy	Marchant
Cole	Granger	Marino
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Matheson
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	McAllister
Conaway	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)
	Grimm	McCaul
	Guthrie	McHenry

Aderholt	Cole	Gerlach
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barber	Cooper	Granger
Barletta	Costa	Graves (MO)
Barr	Cotton	Grimm
Barrow (GA)	Crawford	Hartzler
Beatty	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Billirakis	Delaney	Himes
Boustany	Denham	Hinojosa
Brady (TX)	Dent	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Israel
Bustos	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Forbes	Jolly
Camp	Frankel (FL)	Joyce
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy
Coble	Gallego	King (NY)

McAllister Paulsen
McClintock Pearce
McCollum Pingree (ME)
McDermott Pitts
McGovern Pocan
McHenry Poe (TX)
McIntyre Posey
McMorris Price (GA)
Rodgers Ribble
McNerney Rice (SC)
Meadows Roe (TN)
Meeks Rohrabacher
Messer Rooney
Michaud Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (FL) Ross
Miller (MI) Rothfus
Moore Ruiz
Moran Salmon
Murphy (PA) Sánchez, Linda
Nadler T.
Neugebauer Sanchez, Loretta
Nolan Sanford
Nugent Schrader
Olson Schweikert
Palazzo Scott, Austin
Pallone Sensenbrenner
Pastor (AZ) Serrano

NOES—244

Amodei Farr
Bachus Fattah
Barber Fleischmann
Barr Flores
Beatty Forbes
Becerra Foster
Bera (CA) Foxx
Bishop (GA) Frankel (FL)
Bishop (NY) Franks (AZ)
Blackburn Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer Gabbard
Bonamici Gallego
Boustany Garcia
Brady (PA) Gardner
Brady (TX) Gerlach
Brooks (IN) Gibbs
Brown (FL) Gingrey (GA)
Brownley (CA) Goodlatte
Bucshon Gowdy
Butterfield Granger
Byrne Graves (MO)
Calvert Grayson
Camp Green, Al
Cantor Green, Gene
Capito Griffin (AR)
Carney Griffith (VA)
Carson (IN) Grimm
Carter Gutiérrez
Cartwright Hanna
Castro (TX) Harper
Chabot Hartzler
Chaffetz Hastings (FL)
Cicilline Hastings (WA)
Clyburn Heck (WA)
Coffman Hensarling
Cohen Himes
Conaway Hinojosa
Connolly Holding
Cook Horsford
Cooper Hoyer
Costa Huizenga (MI)
Cotton Hultgren
Courtney Hunter
Cramer Hurt
Crawford Israel
Crenshaw Issa
Crowley Jackson Lee
Cuellar Johnson, E. B.
Culberson Jolly
Cummins Joyce
Davis (CA) Kaptur
Davis, Rodney Kelly (IL)
DeFazio Kelly (PA)
DeGette Kennedy
Delaney Kildee
DeLauro Kilmer
DelBene Kind
Deuth King (IA)
Diaz-Balart King (NY)
Dingell Kingston
Doggett Kinzinger (IL)
Doyle Kline
Duckworth Lamborn
Edwards Lance
Ellison Langevin
Ellmers Larsen (WA)
Engel Larson (CT)
Enyart Latham
Esty Levin
Farenthold Lipinski

Simpson Sires
Slaughter Smith (MO)
Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)
Speier
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Turner
Velázquez
Wagner
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Ruiz Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Denham
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Kirkpatrick
Lankford
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Pascrell
Polis
Rangel
Richmond

□ 2252

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 62, noes 355, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—62

Amash
Barrow (GA)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Conyers
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Gibson
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Holt
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Maffei
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Miller, George
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Perry

Petri
Pocan
Rohrabacher
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shimkus
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Takano
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters

NOES—355

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Camp
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon

Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deuth
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler

Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan

Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman

Weber (TX)	Williams	Woodall	Takano	Veasey	Welch	ndWhitfield	Wolf	Young (IN)
Webster (FL)	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth	Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Williams	Womack	NOT VOTING—14
Welch	Wilson (SC)	Yoder	Tierney	Wasserman	Yarmuth	Wilson (SC)	Woodall	
Wenstrup	Wittman	Yoho	Tonko	Schultz	Yoho	Wittman	Yoder	
Westmoreland	Wolf	Young (AK)	Tsongas	Waters	Young (AK)			
Whitfield	Womack	Young (IN)	Van Hollen	Waxman				

NOT VOTING—14

Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Kirkpatrick	Mulvaney	Rush
Lankford	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Polis	Thompson (MS)
	Rangel	Walz

□ 2256

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 260, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—157

Amash	Garamendi	McDermott
Bass	Gibson	McGovern
Beatty	Gohmert	McIntyre
Becerra	Grayson	McNerney
Benishek	Green, Al	Meng
Blumenauer	Griffith (VA)	Michaud
Bonamici	Grijalva	Miller, George
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Moore
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Broun (GA)	Hanabusa	Nadler
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Capps	Heck (WA)	Neal
Capuano	Higgins	Negrete McLeod
Cárdenas	Himes	Nolan
Carney	Hinojosa	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Holt	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Honda	Pascarell
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Chu	Huelskamp	Payne
Cicilline	Huffman	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Peters (MI)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Petri
Cleaver	Jones	Pingree (ME)
Cohen	Kaptur	Pocan
Connolly	Keating	Posey
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kennedy	Quigley
Crowley	Kildee	Rahall
Cummings	Kilmer	Rigell
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Rohrabacher
DeFazio	Labrador	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	T.
DelBene	Levin	Sanford
Deutch	Lewis	Sanbaranes
Dingell	Loftgren	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lowenthal	Schiff
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Scott (VA)
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Scott, David
Edwards	Maffei	Sensenbrenner
Ellison	Maloney,	Serrano
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter
Esty	Massie	Sires
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Fattah	Matsui	Speier
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Stockman
Gabbard		Swalwell (CA)

NOES—260

Gibbs	Owens
Gingrey (GA)	Palazzo
Goodlatte	Paulsen
Gosar	Pearce
Gowdy	Perry
Granger	Peters (CA)
Graves (GA)	Peterson
Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Green, Gene	Pitts
Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Grimm	Pompeo
Guthrie	Price (GA)
Hall	Reed
Hanna	Reichert
Harper	Renacci
Harris	Ribble
Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Roby
Heck (NV)	Roe (TN)
Hensarling	Rogers (AL)
Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Holding	Rogers (MI)
Hoyer	Rokita
Hudson	Rooney
Huizenga (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Hultgren	Roskam
Hunter	Ross
Hurt	Rothfus
Israel	Royce
Issa	Ruiz
Jenkins	Runyan
Johnson (OH)	Ruppersberger
Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (WI)
Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta
Jordan	Scalise
Joyce	Schneider
Kelly (PA)	Schock
Kind	Schrader
King (IA)	Schwartz
King (NY)	Schweikert
Kingston	Scott, Austin
Kinzinger (IL)	Sessions
Kline	Sewell (AL)
LaMalfa	Sherman
Lamborn	Shimkus
Lance	Shuster
Langvin	Simpson
Larsen (WA)	Sinema
Latham	Smith (MO)
Latta	Smith (NE)
Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Loebsack	Smith (WA)
Long	Southerland
Lowe	Stewart
Lucas	Stivers
Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Lummis	Terry
Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Marino	Thornberry
Matheson	Tiberi
McAllister	Tipton
McCarthy (CA)	Titus
McCauley	Turner
McClintock	Upton
McHenry	Valadao
McKeon	Vargas
McKinley	Vela
McMorris	Visclosky
Rodgers	Wagner
Meadows	Walberg
Meehan	Walden
Meeks	Walorski
Messer	Weber (TX)
Mica	Webster (FL)
Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Moran	Whitfield
Mullin	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Neugebauer	Wittman
Noem	Wolf
Nugent	Womack
Nunes	Woodall
Olson	Yoder
	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Lankford	Lujan Grisham (NM)
----------	--------------------

□ 2259

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 204, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—212

Barber	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Barrow (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Lee (CA)
Bass	Edwards	Levin
Beatty	Ellison	Lewis
Becerra	Engel	Lipinski
Berra (CA)	Enyart	LoBiondo
Billakis	Eshoo	Loebsack
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Loftgren
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lowe
Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Brady (PA)	Foster	Lynch
Braley (IA)	Frankel (FL)	Maffei
Brown (FL)	Gabbard	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gallagher	Carolyn
Burgess	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Garcia	Matheson
Butterfield	Gibson	Matsui
Cantor	Grayson	McCollum
Capito	Green, Al	McDermott
Capps	Green, Gene	McGovern
Capuano	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McKinley
Carney	Grimm	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Cartwright	Hahn	Meng
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Michaud
Castro (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Chu	Heck (WA)	Moore
Cicilline	Higgins	Moran
Clark (MA)	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Nadler
Clay	Holt	Napolitano
Cleaver	Honda	Neal
Cohen	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Connolly	Hoyer	Nolan
Conyers	Huffman	O'Rourke
Cooper	Hultgren	Owens
Costa	Israel	Pallone
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Crowley	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Davis (CA)	Jones	Pelosi
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Perlmutter
DeFazio	Keating	Peters (CA)
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)
DeLauro	Kelly (PA)	Peterson
DelBene	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Deutch	Kildee	Pocan
Dingell	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Doggett	Kind	Quigley
Doyle	King (NY)	Rahall
	Kuster	Reichert
	Lance	Renacci
	Langevin	Rohrabacher
	Larsen (WA)	

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)

NOES—204

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

NOT VOTING—15

Fudge
Johnson (GA)
Kirkpatrick
Lankford
Lujan Grisham (NM)

□ 2304

Mr. MESSER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Speier
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4870) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DISPOSITION OF RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-122)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium is to continue in effect beyond June 25, 2014.

The risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 19, 2014.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MULVANEY (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

Mr. RICHMOND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 20 on account of attending a family matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6043. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan, Conformity Budgets, Emissions Inventories; State of New York [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2014-0182; FRL-9911-56-Region 2] received May 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6044. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions for Permitting of Particulate Matter with Diameters Less Than or Equal to 2.5 Micrometers (PM2.5) [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0495; FRL-9909-35-Region 6] received May 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6045. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund, Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [CC Docket No.: 01-92] received June 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6046. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; 2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services; Rules and Policies Concerning Attribution of Joint Sales Agreements in Local Television Markets [MB Docket No.: 14-50] [MB Docket No.: 09-182] [MB Docket No.: 07-294] [MB Docket No.: 04-256] received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6047. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proposed Revisions to Physical Security Early Site Permit and Reactor Siting Criteria [NRC-2014-0101] received May 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6048. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Manual Operator Actions in Diversity and Defense-in-Depth Analyses [NRC-2009-0515] received May 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6049. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proposed Revision 0 to Fitness-for-Duty — Construction [NRC-2014-0099] received May 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6050. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations Based on the 2013 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary Agreements [Docket No.: 131121983-4407-01] (RIN: 0694-AG02) received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6051. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. and Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation [Docket No.: 140506409-4409-01] (RIN: 0694-AG15) received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6052. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category XV (RIN: 1400-AD33) received May 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6053. A letter from the Chief, Division of Management Authority, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Regulations Implementing the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Updates Following the Fifteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES [Docket No.: FWS-R9-IA-2010-0083] (RIN: 1018-AW82) received May 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6054. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Fishing Year 2014; Recreation Management Measures [Docket No.: 140220164-4164-01] (RIN: 0648-BE00) received May 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6055. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Commercial Groundfish Fishery Management Measures; Rockfish Conservation Area Boundaries for Vessels Using Bottom Trawl Gear; Correction [Docket No.: 130808694-4378-03] (RIN: 0648-BD37) received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6056. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, trans-

mitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Red Hake Accountability Measure [Docket No.: 140421359-4359-01] (RIN: 0648-BE08) received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6057. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2014 Management Measures [Docket No.: 140107014-4014-01] (RIN: 0648-XD072) received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6058. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting annual compilation of financial disclosure statements of the members of the Office of Congressional Ethics, pursuant to Rule XXVI, Clause 3, of the House Rules; (H. Doc. No. 113—121); to the Committee on Ethics and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 6. A bill to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113—477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1281. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 113—478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4092. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools; with an amendment (Rept. 113—479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113—480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARTER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4903. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113—481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3301. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113—482, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 83. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113—483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4289. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 113—484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3301 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 4899. A bill to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent veterans from being disqualified from contributing to health savings accounts by reason of receiving medical care for service-connected disabilities under programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4901. A bill to maximize land management efficiencies, promote land conservation, generate education funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs.

NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4902. A bill to improve college affordability; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide an incentive for households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to purchase certain nutritious fruits and vegetables that are beneficial to good health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 4905. A bill to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 4906. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4907. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 4908. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4909. A bill to provide States with assistance in finding a permanent home for every child; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY

K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to require truncated social security numbers on Form W-2 wage and tax statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4911. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Glendale, New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4912. A bill to limit Department of Defense funds to support United States or Iraqi combat activities in or around Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 4913. A bill to reauthorize the Enhancing Education Through Technology Act of 2001; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4914. A bill to prohibit funding to the Institute of Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4915. A bill to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 4916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4917. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to provide bankruptcy protections for medically distressed debtors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4918. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to expedite review of pharmaceuticals that are approved for marketing in the European Union; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 4919. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licen-

sure and performance guarantees for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. MATHE-SON):

H.R. 4921. A bill to provide for the revision of certification requirements for the labeling of certain electronic products under the Energy Star program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H. Res. 631. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON,

Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. NOLAN):

H. Res. 632. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2014, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

207. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Memorial 2002 urging the Congress to recognize that open-air burn pits impose significant health risks and enact a presumption of a service connection between open-air burn pit exposure and subsequent illnesses that is similar to the presumption in place for exposure to Agent Orange; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 340 urging the President and the Congress to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

209. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 32 urging the Congress to adopt legislation, policies, and procedures to use identity theft-resistant credit cards; to the Committee on Financial Services.

210. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 367 designating the month of May 2014 as "Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

211. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2001 urging the Congress to establish a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

212. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2001 urging the Congress to establish a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

213. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 23 urging the Congress to support the Veterans Health and Benefits Improvement Act of 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

214. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 22 urging the Congress to grant veterans benefits to Filipino Veterans who fought in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

215. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 19 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States veterans who served in the waters defined by the Combat Zone and in the airspace over the Combat Zone in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

216. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 68 urging the Congress to support House Bill 2074; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

217. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 supporting the extension of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

218. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 663 urging the Congress and the President to restore a presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for the United States Navy and Air Force veterans who served on the inland waterways, territorial waters and in the airspace of Vietnam, Thailand, Laos and Cambodia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

219. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 18 supporting the Troop Talent Act of 2013; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 4899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United

States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 4901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by:

10th Amendment

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 4906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 4908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order the enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 4913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7- "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 4915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 4916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 4921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 36: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 303: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 376: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 498: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 676: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 831: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 920: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1015: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1020: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1024: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1070: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1078: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1125: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1331: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1333: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1354: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1462: Mr. HANNA and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1508: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1736: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1750: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1761: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1763: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1771: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1812: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1844: Ms. CLARK of MASSACHUSETTS.
H.R. 1852: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1893: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1905: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1918: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1998: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2002: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2012: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2149: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2328: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2377: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2453: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2500: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2529: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2663: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2673: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2692: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2807: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2835: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2856: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2921: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2959: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 2976: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3040: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3086: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3090: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3199: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3367: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3395: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3486: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 3489: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3508: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3556: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3566: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 3662: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3712: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3722: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3775: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3854: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3877: Mr. CRENSHAW and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3899: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3901: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3905: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3992: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4026: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4035: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4083: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4092: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4188: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4190: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4216: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4217: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4236: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4286: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4301: Mr. DENT and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4321: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4325: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4347: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4351: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4365: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4385: Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4395: Ms. HAHN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4447: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4450: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4510: Ms. ESTY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4582: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4592: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4612: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 4620: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4631: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 4632: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 4636: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4643: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4651: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THORBERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 4653: Mr. SALMON, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 4659: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4699: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4717: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4739: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4749: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4750: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 4780: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 4790: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4813: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4828: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4874: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4882: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4885: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.J. Res. 105: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Res. 330: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 435: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 480: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 538: Mr. MORAN.
H. Res. 587: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 601: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Res. 620: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. POMPEO.

H. Res. 621: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Res. 622: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. Res. 630: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. KUSTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution R-14-0165 urging the President and the Congress to grant temporary protective status to Venezuelans living in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. Also, a petition of the Illinois Commerce Commission, Illinois, relative to a resolution urging the Congress, the Administration, and our Nation to confront challenging fiscal decisions; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: Mr. WALBERG

AMENDMENT No. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: Mr. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer aircraft (including unmanned aerial vehicles), armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents (including chemical agents, biological agents, and associated equipment), launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, or nuclear weapons (as identified for demilitarization purposes outlined in Department of Defense Manual 4160.28) through the Department of Defense Excess Personal Property Program established pursuant to section 1033 of Public Law 104-201, the 'National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1997'.

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: Mr. CONYERS

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to transfer man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) to any entity in Syria.

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: Mr. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer aircraft (including unmanned aerial vehicles), armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents (including chemical agents, biological agents, and associated equipment), launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, or nuclear weapons (as identified for demilitarization purposes outlined in Department of Defense Manual 4160.28) through the Department of Defense Excess Personal

Property Program established pursuant to section 1033 of Public Law 104-201, the 'National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1997'.

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 39: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to "consult", as that term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security

Agency in section 20(c)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3(c)(1)), in contravention of the provision therein which mandates:

"to assure—

(A) use of appropriate information security policies, procedures, and techniques, in order to improve information security. . . ."

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: MR. KILDEE

AMENDMENT No. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1034 of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 4870

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN

AMENDMENT No. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out sections 8107 and 8108.